4.24.'03.

From the Library of

Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

SCC
10,626
v. 10

THE

WORKS

OF

JOHN OWEN, D.D.,

EDITED

BY THE REV. WILLIAM H. GOOLD, EDINBURGH,

AND

REV. CHARLES W. QUICK, PHILADELPHIA.

VOL. X.

AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

WITH

PRELIMINARY EXERCITATIONS.

VOL. I.

"GRACE BE WITH ALL THEM WHO LOVE THE LORD JESUS CHRIST IN SINCERITY."—EPH. vi. 24.

OFFICE FOR THE SALE OF
THE LEIGHTON PUBLICATIONS
1225 SANSOM STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.
1869.

"TAKE HEED UNTO THYSELF, AND UNTO THE DOCTRINE; CONTINUE IN THEM: FOR IN DOING THIS THOU SHALT BOTH SAVE THYSELF, AND THEM THAT HEAR THEE."

1 Timothy, iv. 16.

This edition of the WORKS OF OWEN will consist of seventeen volumes. The first seven volumes will be the same as the corresponding volumes of the London and the Edinburgh edition of the Rev. W. H. Goold, D.D., 1850. The eighth will be identical with the eleventh volume of that edition. The ninth volume will be compiled from the ninth, tenth, and sixteenth volumes of the same edition. Volumes tenth to the sixteenth will contain Owen's exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, according to the edition of Dr. Goold. Volume seventeen will contain an index to the whole series taken from Dr. Goold's index as far as applicable, and embracing references to the matter contained in the Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

CONTENTS.

Vol. I. Life of Dr. Owen, by Rev. Dr. Andrew Thomson.
1. On the Person of Christ.
2. Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ.
3. Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ applied to Sinners and Saints.
4. Two Short Catechisms.

" II. 1. On Communion with God.
2. Vindication of the Preceding Discourse.
3. Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

" III. Discourse on the Holy Spirit; His Name, Nature, Personality, Dispensation, Operations, and Effects—His Work in the Old and New Creation explained, and the Doctrines Vindicated. The Nature and Necessity of Gospel Holiness: the difference between Grace and Morality, or a Spiritual Life unto God in Evangelical Obedience, and a course of Moral Virtues, stated and declared.

" IV. 1. The Reason of Faith.
2. Causes, Ways, and Means, of understanding the Mind of God, as revealed in His Word, with assurance therein. And a declaration of the perspicuity of the Scriptures, with the external means of the interpretation of them.
3. On the Work of the Holy Spirit, in Prayer: with a brief inquiry into the nature and use of Mental Prayer and Forms.
4. Of the Holy Spirit and His Work, as a Comforter and as the Author of Spiritual Gifts.

Vol. V. 1. The doctrine of Justification by Faith.
2. Evidences of the Faith of God's Elect.

" VI. 1. On the Mortification of Sin.
2. On Temptation.
3. On Indwelling Sin in Believers.
4. Exposition of Psalm CXXX.

" VII. 1. On the Nature and Causes of Apostasy, and the Punishment of Apostates.
2. On Spiritual Mindedness.
3. On the dominion of Sin and Grace.

" VIII. The Doctrine of the Saints' Perseverance explained and confirmed.

" IX. Miscellaneous Works, Treatises, and Sermons.
1. The Divine Original and Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures.
2. On the Death of Christ.
3. Posthumous and Sacramental Discourses.

" X. Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews.
1. Concerning the Epistle itself.
2. Concerning the Messiah.
3. Concerning the Institutions of the Jewish Church referred to in the Epistle.

" XI. Exercitations continued.
1. Concerning the Sacramental Office of Christ.
2. Concerning a Day of Sacred Rest.
3. Summary of Observations, drawn from the Exposition of the Epistle.

" XII.—XVI. An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

" XVII. An Index to the whole Series.

CONTENTS.

EXERCITATIONS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

	Page
General Preface by the Editor,	vii
The Epistle Dedicatory,	3
Prefatory Notices,	5

PRELIMINARY EXERCITATIONS.

PART I.

CONCERNING THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Exerc.		
I.—The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews,		25
	Subsidiary Note by the Editor,	64
II.—Of the penman of the Epistle to the Hebrews,		65
	Subsidiary Note by the Editor,	92
III.—The time [and occasion] of the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews,		96
	Subsidiary Note by the Editor,	102
IV.—The language wherein the Epistle to the Hebrews was originally written,		102
	Subsidiary Note by the Editor,	105
V.—Testimonies cited by the apostle out of the Old Testament,		106
	Subsidiary Note by the Editor,	117
	Supplementary Note by the Editor, on the question to whom the Epistle was written,	118
VI.—Oneness of the church,		119
VII.—Of the Judaical distribution of the Old Testament,		125

PART II.

CONCERNING THE MESSIAH.

VIII.—The first dissertation concerning the Messiah, proving him to be promised of old,	141
IX.—Promises of the Messiah vindicated,	185
X.—Appearances of the Son of God under the old testament,	215
XI.—Faith of the ancient church of the Jews concerning the Messiah,	233

EXERC. PAGE
XII.—[Second dissertation]—The promised Messiah long since come, . . 262
XIII.—Other testimonies proving the Messiah to be come, . . . 283
XIV.—Daniel's prophecy vindicated, ... 305
XV.—Computation of Daniel's weeks, ... 332
XVI.—Jewish traditions about the coming of the Messiah, . . . 349
XVII.—The third general dissertation, proving Jesus of Nazareth to be the only true and promised Messiah, ... 367
XVIII.—Jews' objections against Christian religion answered, . . . 424

PART III.

CONCERNING THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE JEWISH CHURCH REFERRED TO IN THE EPISTLE.

XIX.—State and ordinances of the church before the giving of the law, . 446
XX.—The law and precepts thereof, ... 480
XXI.—The sanction of the law in promises and threatenings, . . . 499
XXII.—Of the tabernacle and ark, ... 512
XXIII.—Of the office of the priesthood, ... 520
XXIV.—Sacrifices of the old law, ... 527

GENERAL PREFACE.

It has been matter of thankfulness for many generations of the Christian church, that Dr Owen was led to concentrate all his rare endowments and vast resources on the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Wisdom and prudence of the highest order were required for the task, besides no common measure of learning and ability. The Epistle proves the higher glory of the new dispensation, from the superiority of Christ its founder, in virtue of his divine nature, to angels, to Moses, and to Aaron,—sheds light upon all the offices of Christ, as prophet, and priest, and king,—is designed to conciliate the Jewish mind to the abrogation of the Mosaic ritual, by detailing the superior privileges of the present dispensation,—supplies fuller evidence of the typical and temporary nature of the former than is elsewhere to be found in the word of God,—affords a key to passages in Scripture which are indeed "hard to be understood," as when the 8th Psalm is made unexpectedly radiant with prophetic allusion to the Messiah, and Melchizedek is summoned from the obscurity of ages to illustrate the honours of his priesthood, —and partially withdraws even the curtain which screens from us the scenes of heaven, by its description of the official functions of our great High Priest within the veil. Of an Epistle bearing such characteristics, and having such objects in view, the highest principles of the Christian system necessarily form the chief contents; while its practical warnings against the sin and danger of apostasy from the church of Christ, under any lingering prejudice in favour of an effete and lifeless Judaism, as they derive a peculiar energy from the fearful doom which the apostate is represented as incurring, from the thrilling recital of the triumphs achieved by faith in all ages of the world, and from the sublime reference to the joys and glories of the heavenly Zion in the closing portion of it, present a befitting conclusion to an argument as lofty and momentous as the entire compass of revelation exhibits. The very language of the Epistle rises, in the original, to a corresponding elevation with the themes which it is employed to discuss; and the weightiest argument against its Pauline origin rests upon its purity of style and dignity of tone, which are held to be superior to the ordinary composition of the apostle of the Gentiles.

It is on all hands admitted that the practical object for which the Epistle seems to have been written was, to preserve Jewish converts from relapsing into Judaism. Its divine origin, the imposing grandeur of its ritual, and the cherished associations connected with its whole history, might influence the mind of a Jew, in some moment of temptation and weakness, to betake himself afresh to a system re-

specting which even the Christian, who denied its continued obligation, was ready to admit that it was promulgated originally under the highest seals of divine authority. The argument by which the steadfastness of the primitive converts was secured, and the superior glory of the Christian dispensation vindicated, rests mainly upon two principles,—the divine glory of its Founder, and the typical character of the rites and sacrifices under the law. In regard to the former of these truths, it cannot be affirmed that there is any novel or peculiar disclosure in this Epistle beyond what may be obtained from other parts of revelation; but in no other inspired book is the typical character of the Mosaic ritual declared and elucidated with any degree of fulness, as the definite and formal object of the writer. It is a perilous experiment for any system, slowly evolved in the course of ages, when its separate parts, coloured with the changeful hue of the different times and circumstances in which they came to light, are tested with the view of ascertaining if they possess the unity and coherence which truth, and truth only, can under such a trial evince. Any essential inconsistency would be fatal to the claims and pretensions of the system. But when a body of truths, having in themselves no abstract and necessary relationship, such as links the principles and axioms of geometry into the unity of a science, hazards its entire character and authority upon the assertion that some change, annulling the outward forms in which it had been previously embodied, has not only left its essential principles unimpaired, but stamped upon them a confirmation so important and so indispensable that without it they would be proved untenable and absurd,—it must be felt that a system which comes safely out of the testing ordeal of such a change is entitled to our implicit confidence. Accordingly, Christian scholarship and genius have laboured with peculiar care to establish the connection between the old and new dispensations. The perfect symmetry in the temple of divine truth must ever constrain admiration; and when the disappearance of typical rites is seen to be tantamount to the removal of the scaffolding, so as to unveil the finished beauty of the edifice, the demonstration is complete that Christianity is indeed from God. If the Epistle to the Hebrews had not been given us, we would have had little direct and explicit ratification of the principle by which type and antitype are connected. The correspondence between them exhibits and proves the unity of divine truth under a change of external rites and forms so complete, as, but for the identity of the principles embodied in them, might have seemed incompatible with the divine authority of either economy, and yet so indispensable that both economies shed on each other the lustre of mutual confirmation. It is on this ground that we can vindicate fully the language of our author, to which needless exception has sometimes been taken as exaggerated,—that "this Epistle is as useful to the church as the sun is to the world." It is the key-stone which locks the arch of revealed truth into symmetry and strength.

The degree to which Dr Owen has succeeded in his task is indicated in the graceful critique upon this Exposition, in the life of the author prefixed to his miscellaneous works, Vol. I. p. lxxxiv. There is not much to be added in regard to the history of the work. In the year 1668, when his public ministrations as a preacher of the gospel were considerably interrupted by the severity of the times, Owen seems to have prosecuted his literary labours with the more assiduity, giving to the world not merely his valuable treatises on the Nature of Indwelling Sin, and on Psalm cxxx., but the first volume of his greatest work, the Exposition which follows, and which originally appeared in four folio volumes. It was the result of deep and earnest investigation, pursued for many years; and in subserviency to it, we learn, on his own authority, that the whole course of his previous studies had been regulated. In 1674, though he was reduced to such infirmity that we find him at Tunbridge Wells for the benefit of his health, and though he was involved in all the bitter distractions of the Communion controversy, he is able, amid growing years and weakness, to lay the church of Christ under increasing obligations to him, by the publication, not to refer to minor productions, of two massive folios, his "Discourse on the Holy Spirit," and the second volume of the present work. He was quite as busy, vindicating Dissenters from unfounded charges, in 1680, when the third volume issued from the press. Death overtook him before the publication of the fourth, but not before he had brought it to completion; so that the whole work reaches us as his precious bequest to the church of Christ, and the utterance of his dying testimony for the truth; and by means of it, our author, to employ the language of the Epistle that proved the subject of his closing labours upon the earth, "being dead, yet speaketh."

Considering the full explanation given by Dr Owen himself, in his various prefaces, of the plan which he adopted and the objects which he had in view throughout his commentary, we need not obtrude upon the reader any further remarks on these points. The nature of the Exposition is threefold;—partly critical, in the brief comment sometimes made on the text and language of the Epistle; partly doctrinal, in the ample and thorough discussion of the great truths of which the language is the vehicle; and partly practical, in the observations immediately bearing on life and duty with which these discussions are generally followed up. That so much of the Exercitations, and of the earlier portion of the Exposition, should be occupied with a refutation of Socinian and Jewish errors, is a circumstance admitting of explanation, from the progress which Socinianism was making in the times of Owen, and from the lingering deference that was paid to the notions of the Jews on all matters of Hebrew literature and learning. The space occupied with these controversial discussions may sometimes lead the reader away from the direct consideration of the Epistle, but it was professedly to meet these errors that the work was undertaken; and the Epistle itself gives prominence to the very doctrines on which a Chris-

tian author comes most directly into collision with those who impugn the divinity of Christ, or deny that he was the promised Messiah.

The Exercitations, though they have been in some measure overlooked, will be found of singular and permanent value when they are carefully examined. They are by no means detached, desultory productions; they proceed in a systematic and orderly course. The first part of them relates to such general questions as the canonicity, the authorship, and the date of the Epistle, and the language in which it was written, together with the occasion which mainly rendered it necessary, namely, the mistakes of the Jews, in denying the oneness of the church in all ages, and in adhering to the oral law or mere tradition. The second part, in a series of dissertations, embraces the illustration and defence of three great principles upon which the reasoning in the Epistle proceeds,—namely, that a Messiah had been promised, that before the Epistle was written he had already come in the flesh, and that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. The third part discusses the institutions of the ancient Jewish church. The fourth part unfolds at great length the sacerdotal office of Christ. And the fifth, originally published as a separate treatise in 1671, enters largely on the whole question of the Sabbath. This last, as it was designed to be included in the preliminary Exercitations to this commentary, and indeed so forestalls it that without them the exposition of the fourth chapter would be very defective, was appended by Dr Wright to the other Exercitations,—an arrangement so obviously proper that we have not deviated from it in the present edition. The mere summary of their contents, however, must fail to give an adequate impression of their merits. They contain the ripest thoughts of the author on the subjects to which they relate, while they will be found a repertory of much curious and interesting matter,—such as the arguments of the Jews against Christianity, the passages in the Targums which allude to the Messiah, and the digest of the law into 613 precepts by the celebrated Maimonides.

The Exposition was favourably received both on the Continent and in this country. Mr Simon Commenicq, a merchant in Rotterdam, translated it into Dutch. Under his care it was printed in seven quarto volumes at Amsterdam, 1733–40; and he distributed most of the impression gratuitously. According to Le Long, a proposal was made at Amsterdam in 1700 to translate it into Latin. Dr Williams of Rotherham published, in 1790, an abridgment of it in four octavo volumes; and of this abridgment a second edition appeared in 1815, with material corrections and improvements, under the superintendence of Ingram Cobbin, A.M. In 1812, a complete edition, in seven octavo volumes, was published under the editorial care of Dr Wright. A reprint of this last edition, in four bulky octavo volumes, was published by Mr Tegg in 1840.

It is a singular feature in the criticisms which have been passed on the works of our author, that each critic generally evinces peculiar admiration for some one of his works, in decided preference to all the rest. Dr M'Crie coveted the honour of having written his

treatise on the Person of Christ; Ryland pronounced his Latin work on the Origin and Progress of Theology "incomparable,"—"the greatest work ever written by a British divine;" Dr Lindsay Alexander speaks of his work on the Holy Spirit as his "master-work;" Mr Wilberforce especially recommended his treatise on the Mortification of Sin. There is reason to believe, however, that Owen himself regarded the Exposition as the production by which he had rendered the most service to the cause of divine truth, and on which his reputation as a theological author would chiefly depend. On finishing it he laid down his pen, exclaiming, "Now my work is done; it is time for me to die!"

It is impossible to embrace all the testimonies which have been given to the pre-eminent value of this great work,—a value not in the least degree abated by all which has been subsequently published in exposition of this Epistle; for though in verbal exegesis subsequent scholarship has greatly distanced Owen, there is scarcely any theological truth of the least importance, embodied in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the discovery and illustration of which have not been anticipated by his sagacious research. In accordance with the course adopted in the prefatory notes to his miscellaneous writings, we may record a few opinions which have been expressed by eminent authorities in approbation of Owen's labours as an expositor. Walch thus speaks of it: "Egregium est opus hoc, locuples testis de auctoris singulari eruditione, atque industria quam ad illud conficiendum adhibuit." According to Tholuck, "It gives evidence of the learning and theological insight of its truly pious author." Mr Bridges describes it as "probably the most elaborate and instructive comment on a detached portion of Scripture." Dr Chalmers pronounces it "the greatest work of John Owen,"—"a work of gigantic strength as well as gigantic size; and he who hath mastered it is very little short, both in respect to the doctrinal and practical of Christianity, of being an erudite and accomplished theologian." Bogue and Bennett, in their "History of Dissenters" (vol. ii. 236), give warm expression to their feelings of admiration: "If the theological student should part with his coat or his bed to procure the works of Howe, he that would not sell his shirt to procure those of John Owen, and especially his Exposition, of which every sentence is precious, shows too much regard to his body, and too little for his immortal mind."

Certain characteristics will be noticed in this edition which, it is hoped, will be regarded as improvements. As in the original edition, all the prefaces are given at length. In the edition of Dr Wright, and in the reprint of Mr Tegg, a preface is given which is made up of all the different prefaces by Owen, and which omits some interesting statements, by no means deserving to be consigned to oblivion. The Italics of the original edition are partially restored; and, by a variety of type, criticism on the language and text of the original is discriminated from the doctrinal and practical expositions. Notes are appended to the purely critical discussions, embracing the substance of modern criticism on the more important passages. The

Greek text is carefully revised. Subsidiary notes are inserted among the Exercitations, on the topics commonly included under what is termed "Introduction." More especially, the language of the author is left untouched and unmodified. The attempt has been made in former editions to modernize the composition; but while it has thus been rendered in some respects more smooth and less obscure, serious damage has been done, although most unintentionally, to the meaning of Owen in several instances, while manifest errata, such as "foregoing" instead of "following," and "possibly" instead of "positively," have been left uncorrected. In the edition by Dr Wright, in which this attempt to improve the style of Owen was chiefly made, no great amount of care seems to have been taken to correct the Hebrew, the Greek, the Latin, the quotations from various authors, and the Scripture references. In regard to all these particulars very decided improvement will be found in the present edition.

The portrait engraved for this volume is from an old engraving by Vertue, prefixed to the collection of our author's sermons and tracts published in 1721.

An acknowledgment is due of the valuable help received by the Editor in his labours from the Rev. John Edmondston of Ashkirk, without whose friendly counsel and active co-operation volumes of such number and extent as are contained in the present work could not have been brought out in the limited time allotted for the preparation of them, with the accuracy which, it is believed, they possess.

Dr Owen in all his works, and nowhere more than in the following Exercitations and Exposition, while he seems absolutely to riot in a prodigality of massive thought and learned illustration, manifests a constant zeal, and a desire that all his readers share with him in his zeal, for the glory of Christ and the advancement of personal godliness. He had no ambition merely to acquire fame by rustling amid the dead leaves of controversy and criticism; his hand is ever dropping into the mind of his reader the precious seeds of quickening truth. The same sky that dispenses its thunder against every heretical assault on the paramount dignity of the Saviour, is ever distilling its showers of gentler influence for the refreshment of many a weary heart. That this work, in its present form,—a work to which Owen consecrated the best energies of his life,—may be subservient to this holy result,—may promote higher views of the glory of Him who is "the brightness of his Father's glory," may deepen in every Christian reader his sense of responsibility for the enjoyment of Christian privilege, may recall the truant from the school of Christ to the feet of the great Teacher, and rouse many a sinner to flee from the wrath to come to the covert of that atoning blood which speaketh better things than that of Abel,—is the prayer of him who edits, as he is sure would have been the prayer of him who was honoured of God to indite the following Exposition.

W. H. G.

EDINBURGH, *March* 1854.

EXERCITATIONS

ON

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

ALSO,

CONCERNING THE MESSIAH:

WHEREIN

THE PROMISES CONCERNING HIM TO BE A SPIRITUAL REDEEMER OF MANKIND ARE EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED;

HIS COMING, AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF HIS WORK, ACCORDING TO THE PROMISES, ARE PROVED AND CONFIRMED;

THE PERSON, OR WHO HE IS, IS DECLARED;

THE WHOLE ECONOMY OF THE MOSAICAL LAW, RITES, WORSHIP, AND SACRIFICES, IS EXPLAINED:

AND IN ALL,

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON, OFFICE, AND WORK OF THE MESSIAH, IS OPENED;
THE NATURE AND DEMERIT OF THE FIRST SIN IS UNFOLDED;
THE OPINIONS AND TRADITIONS OF THE ANCIENT AND MODERN JEWS ARE EXAMINED;
THEIR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE LORD CHRIST AND THE GOSPEL ARE ANSWERED;
THE TIME OF THE COMING OF THE MESSIAH IS STATED;
AND THE GREAT FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF THE GOSPEL VINDICATED.

[ALSO,]

CONCERNING THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST:

WHEREIN

THE ORIGINAL, CAUSES, NATURE, PREFIGURATIONS, AND DISCHARGE OF THAT HOLY OFFICE, ARE EXPLAINED AND VINDICATED;

THE NATURE OF THE COVENANT OF THE REDEEMER, WITH THE CALL OF THE LORD CHRIST UNTO HIS OFFICE, IS DECLARED;

AND THE OPINIONS OF THE SOCINIANS ABOUT IT ARE FULLY EXAMINED, AND THEIR OPPOSITION UNTO IT REFUTED.

TOGETHER WITH

EXERCITATIONS CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL, NATURE, USE, AND CONTINUANCE, OF

A DAY OF SACRED REST.

NOTE IN REGARD TO THE PREFACES.

In previous reprints of this work, instead of the prefaces which the author himself had written for the different parts of the work as they issued from the press, one general preface was concocted out of them all. The design may have been to save space, but it seems scarcely fair that the work should appear without the author's explanation of the objects which he had in view as indicated in his own language, and of the circumstances in which each volume originally appeared. The result, moreover, of this unwarrantable attempt at compression, was the omission of some interesting paragraphs, which shed light upon his state of health at the time when the volumes were published. All these prefaces are now published in full. The first of them, page 5, was prefixed to the first volume of the work, published in 1668, immediately before the introductory Exercitations; and the second appeared in the same volume, before the Exposition of two chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews. To the second volume, published in 1674, was prefixed the preface which is numbered III. in the following arrangement. The third volume, published in 1680, contained the fourth preface. To the fourth volume, published in 1684, one year after the author's death, the fifth preface belongs, with the initials H. G. attached to it.—Ed.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR WILLIAM MORRICE, KNIGHT,

ONE OF HIS MAJESTY'S MOST HONOURABLE PRIVY COUNCIL, AND PRINCIPAL SECRETARY OF STATE, ETC.

SIR,

THE dedication of books unto persons of worth and honour hath secured itself from the impeachment of censure, by taking sanctuary in the usage of all times and ages. Herein, therefore, as none is needed, so I shall make use of no apology. But the consideration of some circumstances (needless to be repeated) seems to render an account of the reason of my particular address unto you in this manner necessary. This, therefore, I shall give, but briefly:—

"Ne longo sermone morer tua tempora."

That which principally, in this matter, I resolved my thoughts into, was a design to answer my own inclination and desire, in testifying a respectful honour to a person who, in a place of eminency, hath given so fair an example of a singular conjunction, in himself, of civil prudence and all manner of useful literature, with their mutual subserviency unto each other: an endeavour whereof the wisdom of all ages hath esteemed needful, though few individuals have attained unto it: for whereas a defect in learning hath tempted some, otherwise prudent and wise in the management of affairs, unto a contempt of it; and skill therein hath given unto others a mistaken confidence that it alone is sufficient for all the ends of human life; an industrious attempt for a furnishment of the mind with a due mixture of them both hath been greatly neglected, to the no small disadvantage of human affairs. It cannot, therefore, seem strange, nor ought any to be offended, that one who dares profess a great honour unto and admiration of both these endowments of the mind of man, should express them with that respect which alone he is capable to give, unto him who, in a place of eminent trust and employment, hath given a singular instance of their happy conjunction and readiness to coalesce in the same mind, to enable it unto a regular and steady pursuit of their common ends. Whether I shall by this address attain that end or no I know not; but this is that which principally I aimed at therein: and to the reason whereof I leave the judgment of my undertakings. But yet I may not omit, that your favour hath also given me particular grounds for this confidence, and such as have been prevalent against those impressions of discouragements which I am naturally very liable to admit of and receive. Your candid esteem of some former endeavours in this kind (and which when carried without the verge of those lines of communication within whose compass men and their writings are judged by party, and scarce otherwise have received a fair acceptance in the world) were no small encouragement unto me, not to desert those wearisome labours which have no other reward or end but the furtherance of public good, especially having this only way left me to serve the will of God and the interest of the church in my generation. It was also through the countenance of your favour that this and some other

treatises have received warrant to pass freely into the world; which though I am uncertain of what advantage they may be unto any, by reason of their own defects and the prejudices of others, yet I want not the highest security that there is nothing in them tending to the least disadvantage unto those whose concernment lies in peace and truth in these nations.

For the treatises themselves, which I desire herewith to represent to some of your leisure hours, I shall not offend against the public service in detaining you with an account of them. Their subject-matter, as to its weight, worth, and necessity, will speak for itself; the main objects of our present faith and principal foundations of our future expectations, our pleas and evidences for a blessed eternity, are here insisted on. And whether the temptations, opinions, and bold presumptions of many in these days, do not call for a renewed consideration and confirmation of them, is left to the judgment of persons indifferent and unprejudiced; the manner of their handling is submitted unto yours, which is highly and singularly esteemed by,

Sir,

Your most humble and obliged servant,

JOHN OWEN.

March 20, 1667.

PREFATORY NOTICES.

I.—TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

Christian Reader,

If thou intendest to engage any part of thy time in the perusal of the ensuing Discourses and Exposition, it may not be amiss to take along with thee the consideration of some things, concerning the design and aim of their author in the writing and present publishing of them, which are here proposed unto thee. It is now sundry years since I purposed in myself, if God gave life and opportunity, to endeavour, according to the measure of the gift received, an Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. A subject this was, I then knew, and now acknowledge, much laboured in by many eminent and learned men, both of old and of late. In particular, some entire commentaries, composed with good judgment and to very good purpose, have been published in our own language; yea, from him who first began a serious exposition of this Epistle, and whom none in all things have to this day exceeded, there have passed few ages wherein some or other have not endeavoured the explication of it. And this, also, hath been done by men of all sorts and parties, of all persuasions and opinions in Christian religion; an account of whose several endeavours shall elsewhere be given. Somewhat there was of encouragement unto me in my designed undertaking, and somewhat of quite another tendency, in this consideration.

The help which I might receive from the sedulous labours of so many learned men, and those in times, places, principles, distant and distinguished from each other, as also managing their common design with great variety as to particular intentions, I looked on as a matter of no small advantage unto me. Some, I found, had *critically* examined many of the words, phrases, and expressions of the writer; some had compared his *quotations* with the places in the Old Testament from whence they were taken; some had endeavoured an *analysis* of the several discourses of the author, with the nature and force of the arguments insisted on by him: the labours of some were to improve the truths contained in the Epistle unto *practice;* others had collected the *difficulties* which they observed therein, and scanned them in a scholastical way, with objections and solutions, after their manner; others had an especial design unto *the places whose sense is controverted* amongst the several parties at variance in Christian religion:—all in their way and manner endeavouring to give light to the intentions of the Holy Ghost, either in particular passages or in the whole Epistle. The helps and advantages, in the investigation of the mind of God, which by their labours might be obtained, I looked on as a great encouragement to undertake the same work with them, and to promote the light of truth thereby.

But, on the other side, no small objection unto the whole work and design did hence also arise; for it might seem to some altogether needless to engage in that which so many had already gone through with, to the great profit and edification of the church. And nothing can or ought more justly to weaken and take off the resolution of any in this kind of endeavours, than that they are needless: for whatever is so, will also thereby be useless; and, because useless, burdensome. This consideration, I confess, did for a long time deter me from executing my purpose

of casting my mite into this treasury. But yet, after I had made a thorough perusal of all the comments, expositions, annotations, or observations on the Epistle, which by any means I could obtain, I returned again, upon sundry considerations, unto my former thoughts and resolutions. For, first, I found the excellency of the writing to be such; the depths of the mysteries contained in it to be so great; the compass of the truth asserted, unfolded, and explained, so extensive and diffused through the whole body of Christian religion; the usefulness of the things delivered in it so important and indispensably necessary; as that I was quickly satisfied that the wisdom, grace, and truth, treasured in this sacred storehouse, are so far from being exhausted and fully drawn forth by the endeavours of any or all that are gone before us, or from being all perfectly brought forth to light by them, as that I was assured there was left a sufficient ground and foundation, not only for renewed investigation after rich branches in this mine for the present generation, but for all them that shall succeed, unto the consummation of all things. For, if we find it thus in human sciences, that no ability, no industry, no combination of the most happy wits for their improvement, in former ages, hath precluded the way unto persons of ingenuity and learning to add considerably in several kinds unto their respective advancement,—nor shall the sedulity of this present age, in the furtherance and adorning of them, be ever able to bring them unto any such perfection as to condemn succeeding generations unto the slothful and servile drudgery of the mere perusal of their dictates and prescriptions, and so, by the use of their inventions, leave unto others only that of their memory.—how much more must we grant the same in things divine, and the spiritual knowledge of them, whose stores in this life are absolutely inexhaustible, and whose depths are not fully to be fathomed? Again; it is evident that the principal things asserted and taught in this Epistle,—such as is the doctrine of the person and the priesthood of Jesus Christ,—have received a more eager and subtile opposition since the labours and endeavours of the most in the exposition of it, than they had done before. And as this renders the vindication of the places wherein they are taught and asserted necessary, so it is not unknown, unto those who are conversant in these kinds of studies, what advantage may be obtained in the investigation of truth by the opposition that is made unto it, especially when that opposition is managed with a curious search into every word and syllable which may seem to give countenance unto it, as also in the sifting of every tittle and particle that stand in its way; which course of procedure the enemies of the truth mentioned have, with much art and industry, engaged themselves into. But that which most of all took off the weight of the discouragement that arose from the multiplied endeavours of learned men in this kind, was an observation that all of them, being intent on the sense of the words as absolutely considered, and the use of them to the present church, had much overlooked the direct respect and regard that the author had in the writing of this Epistle to the then past, present, and future condition of the Hebrews, or church of the Jews. Looking at these things as dead and buried, of no use in the present state of the church, they did either wholly neglect them, or pass them over in a light and perfunctory manner; nor, indeed, had many of them, though otherwise excellently well qualified, a competency of skill for the due consideration of things of that nature. But yet, those that shall seriously and with judgment consider the design of the writer of this Epistle, the time wherein he wrote it, the proper end for which it was composed, the subject-matter treated of in it, the principles he proceeds upon, and his manner of arguing, will easily perceive, that without a serious consideration of them it is not possible to come to a right comprehension, in many things, of the mind of the Holy Ghost therein. Many principles of truth he takes for granted, as acknowledged amongst the Hebrews during their former church-state, and makes them a foundation for his own superstructure; many customs, usages, ordinances, in-

stitutions, received sense of places of Scripture amongst the Jews, he either produceth or reflects upon; and one way or other makes use of the whole Mosaical economy, or system of divine worship under the law, unto his own purpose. The common neglect of these things, or slight transaction of them in most expositors, was that which principally relieved me from the fore-mentioned discouragement.

And this also was that which at length gave rise unto those Exercitations which take up the greatest part of the ensuing book. Some of them are, indeed, indispensably due to the work itself. Such are those which concern *the canonical authority* of the Epistle, the *writer* of it, the *time* of its writing, the *phraseology* of the author, with the way he proceeds in the *quotations* of testimonies out of the Old Testament, and some others of the same tendency. The residue of them were occasioned merely by the consideration before insisted on. Some great principles I observed that the apostle supposed, which he built all his arguings and exhortations upon; not directly proving or confirming the principles themselves, but as taking them for granted, partly from the faith of the Judaical church, and partly from the new revelation of the gospel, which those to whom he wrote did as yet admit of and avow. Such were these:—That there was a Messiah promised from the foundation of the world, to be a spiritual redeemer of mankind; that this Messiah was come, and had performed and accomplished the work assigned unto him for the end of their redemption; that Jesus of Nazareth was this Messiah. Not one line in the whole Epistle but is in an especial manner resolved into these principles, or deduced from them. These, therefore, I found it necessary to examine and confirm, to unfold, vindicate, and declare; that their influence into the apostle's discourse might be manifest, and his arguing from them be understood. It is true, I have so handled them as all along to represent the opinions of the incredulous, apostate Jews about them, and to vindicate them from the exceptions of their greatest masters, of old and of late; but he that shall look on these considerations and discourses as a matter only of *controversy with the Jews*, will but evidence his own weakness and ignorance in things of this nature. Who knows not that they are the very fundamental principles of our Christian profession, and which, because of that opposition that is made unto them, ought to be frequently inculcated and strongly confirmed? And if learned men find it, in this day, necessary for them to dispute for, to prove and vindicate, the very principles of natural theology, the being and attributes of God, the truth whereof hath left indelible characters of itself upon the minds of all the children of men, how much more necessary must it needs be to endeavour the confirmation and re-enforcement of those grand principles of supernatural revelation, which have no contribution of evidence from the inbred, inexpugnable light of nature, and yet are no less indispensably necessary unto the future condition of the souls of men than those others are! I am not therefore without hope that the handling of them, as it was necessary unto my design, so it will not be unacceptable unto the candid reader. For what is mixed in our discourses of them concerning Judaical customs, opinions, practices, expositions, interpretations of promises, traditions, and the like, will not, I hope, give distaste unto any, unless it be such as, being ignorant of them and unacquainted with them, will choose so to continue, rather than be instructed by them whom they would by no means have supposed to be in any thing more knowing than themselves. I doubt not, therefore, but our endeavours on that subject will be able to secure their own station as to their usefulness, both by the importance of the matters treated of in them, as also from the necessity of laying them as a sure foundation unto the ensuing Exposition of the Epistle itself.

Besides these general principles, there are also sundry other things, belonging to the Mosaical order and frame of divine worship, which the apostle either directly treateth of, or one way or other improves unto his own peculiar design. This, also, he doth sometimes directly and intentionally, and sometimes *in transitu*,

reflecting on them, and as it were only calling them to mind, leaving the Hebrews to the consideration of what concerning them they had been formerly instructed in. Such is the whole matter of the priesthood and sacrifices of the law, of the tabernacle and utensils of it, of the old covenant, of the giving of the law, the commands, precepts, and sanctions of it, in its promises and threatenings, rewards and punishments. Hereunto, also, he adds a remembrance of the call of Abraham, with the state and condition of the people from thence unto the giving of the law, with sundry things of the like nature. Without a competent comprehension of and acquaintance with these things, and their relation to the will and worship of God, it is altogether in vain for any one to imagine that they may arrive unto any clear understanding of the mind of the Holy Ghost in this portion of Scripture.

Now, as I had observed that the consideration and explanation of them had been too much neglected by the generality of expositors, so I quickly found that to insist at large upon them, and according as their weight doth deserve, in the particular places wherein the mention of them doth occur, would too often and too much divert me from the pursuit of the especial design of the apostle in those places, and disenable the reader from carrying on the tendency of the whole in the perusal of it. To prevent both which inconveniencies I fixed upon the course the reader will find insisted on,—namely, to handle them all severally and apart in previous Exercitations.

Having given this general account of my design and purpose in the ensuing Discourses, some few requests unto the reader shall absolve him from further attendance in this entrance: First, I must beg his candid interpretation of the reporting of some of those Jewish fables and traditions which he will meet withal in some of the Exercitations. I could plead *necessity and use*, and those such as will evince themselves in the several places and passages of the discourses where they are reported; for they are none of them nakedly produced, to satisfy the curiosity of any, but either the investigation of some truth hidden under them and involved in them, or the discovery of their rise and occasion, or the laying open of the folly of the pretences of the present Jews in their unbelief, doth still accompany their recital: however, I will not rigidly justify the production of all and every of them, but put it amongst those things wherein the candour of the reader may have an opportunity to exercise itself. I must beg also of the learned reader a consideration of the state and condition wherein, through the good providence of God, I have been during the greatest part of the time wherein these Exercitations were written and printed; and I shall pray, in requital of his kindness, that he may never know by experience what impressions of failings, mistakes, and several defects in exactness, uncertainties, straits, and exclusion from the use of books, will bring and leave upon endeavours of this kind. And whatever defects he may meet withal, or complain of in these discourses, my design was, through the blessing of God, that he should have no cause to complain of want of diligence and industry in me. But yet I am sensible, in the issue, that many things may seem to represent that carelessness of mind, or precipitancy in writing, which is altogether unmeet to be imposed on men in this knowing age. But whatever other reflections I may be obnoxious unto, for the want of ability and judgment,—which in me are very small in reference to so great an undertaking,—I must crave of the reader to believe that I would not willingly be guilty of so much importune confidence as to impose upon him things trite, crude, and undigested, which either ordinary prudence might have concealed, or ordinary diligence have amended. Whatever, therefore, of that kind may appear unto him, I would crave that it may be laid upon the account of the condition which I have intimated before.

For the Exposition of the Epistle itself, whereof I have given here a specimen in the first two chapters, I confess, as was said before, that I have had thoughts for many years to attempt something in it, and in the whole course of my studies

have not been without some regard thereunto. But yet I must now say, that, after all searching and reading, prayer and assiduous meditation on the text have been my only reserve, and far most useful means of light and assistance. By these have my thoughts been freed from many and many an entanglement, which the writings of others on the same subject had either cast me into, or could not deliver me from. Careful I have been, as of my life and soul, to bring no prejudicate sense unto the words, to impose no meaning of my own or other men upon them, nor to be imposed on by the reasonings, pretences, or curiosities of any, but always went nakedly to the word itself, to learn humbly the mind of God in it, and to express it as he should enable me. To this end I always in the first place considered the sense, meaning, and importance of the *words* of the text; and the consideration of their original derivation, use in other authors, especially in the LXX. of the Old Testament, in the books of the New, particularly the writings of the same author, was constantly made use of to that purpose. Oftimes the words expressed out of the Hebrew, or the things alluded unto amongst that people, I found to give much light into the words of the apostle themselves. Unto the general rule, of attending unto the design and scope of the place, subject treated of, mediums fixed on for arguments, methods of ratiocination, I still kept in my eye the time and season of writing this Epistle; the state and condition of them to whom it was written,—their persuasions, prejudices, customs, light, and traditions; the covenant and worship of the church of old; the translation of covenant privileges and worship over unto the Gentiles upon a new account; the course of providential dispensations that the people were under; the near expiration of their church and state, with the speedy approaching of their utter abolition and destruction; with the temptations that befell them on all these various accounts;—without which it is impossible for any one justly to follow the apostle, so as to keep close to his design or fully to understand his mind and meaning. If any shall think that I have referred too many things unto the customs and usages of the Jews, and looked too much after some guidance in sundry expressions and discourses of the apostle from them, I only answer, that as, when I am convinced by particular instances of mistakes therein, I shall willingly acknowledge them, so for the present I am satisfied that other expositors have had much too little regard thereunto. The exposition of the text is attended with an improvement of *practical observations*, answering the great end for which the Epistle was committed over to all generations for the use of the church. If in some of them I shall seem to any to have been too prolix, I must only answer, that having no other way to serve the edification of the generality of Christians, I thought not so. Yet, to prevent their further objections on that account, I intend, if ever any addition in the same work be prepared for public view, to regulate my proceedings therein according as I shall have account from persons of learning and godliness concerning that course of procedure which they esteem to tend most to the good and edification of the church of God; to whose judgment I heartily submit these and all other endeavours of the like kind whereunto I have been, or yet may be called.

JOHN OWEN.

II.—THE PREFACE.

THE general concernments of this Epistle have all of them been discussed and cleared in the preceding Exercitations and Discourses. The things and matters confirmed in them we therefore here suppose, and take for granted. And they are such, some of them, as without a demonstration whereof a genuine and perspicuous declaration of the design of the author, and sense of the Epistle, cannot be well

founded or carried on. Unto them, therefore, we must remit the reader who desires to peruse the ensuing Exposition with profit and advantage. But yet, because the *manner of the handling* of things in those Discourses may not be so suited unto the minds of all who would willingly inquire into the Exposition itself, I shall here make an entrance into it, by laying down some such general principles and circumstances of the Epistle as may give a competent prospect into the design and argument of the apostle in the whole thereof:—

1. The first of these concerns the *persons* whose instruction and edification in the faith is here aimed at. These in general were the Hebrews, the posterity of Abraham, and the only church of God before the promulgation of the gospel; who in those days were distributed into three sorts or parties:—

1. Some of them, *believing* in Christ through the gospel, were perfectly instructed in the *liberty* given them from the Mosaical law, with the foundation of that liberty in its accomplishment in the person, office, and work of the Messiah, Acts ii. 41, 42.

2. Some, with their *profession of faith* in Christ as the Messiah promised, retained an opinion of the *necessary observation of Mosaical rites;* and these also were of two sorts:—(1.) Such as, from a *pure reverence of their original institutions,* either being not fully instructed in their liberty, or, by reason of prejudices, not readily admitting the consequences of that truth wherein they were instructed, abode in their observation, without seeking for righteousness or salvation by them, Acts xxi. 20. (2.) Such as urged their observation as indispensably *necessary to our justification* before God, Acts xv. 1; Gal. iii., iv. The first sort of these the apostles bare with in all meekness, yea, and, using the liberty given them of the Lord, to avoid offending of them, joined with them in their practice as occasion did require, Acts xvi. 3. xxi. 23, 24, 26, xxvii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 20; whence for a long season, in many places, the worship of the gospel and synagogue worship of the law were observed together, James ii. 2; though in process of time many disputes and differences were occasioned thereby between the Gentile and Jewish worshippers, Rom. xiv. The other sort they opposed as perverters of the gospel which they pretended to profess, Acts xv. 5, 6; Gal. ii. 13–16, iv. 9–11, v. 2. And of these some afterwards apostatized to Judaism; others, abiding in a corrupt mixture of both professions, separated themselves from the church, and were called Nazarenes and Ebionites.

3. Others,—far the greatest number of the whole people,—persisted in their old church-state, not receiving the salvation that was tendered unto them in the preaching of the gospel; and these also were of two sorts:—(1.) Such as, although they had not embraced the faith, yet were *free and willing to attend unto the doctrine of it,* "searching the Scriptures" for a discovery of its truth, and in the meantime "instantly serving God," according to the light of the Old Testament which they had received; and in these was the essence of the Judaical church preserved unto its final dissolution, Acts xvii. 11, xxviii. 22–24. (2.) Such as, being hardened in their infidelity, *blasphemed,* scoffed at, and persecuted the gospel, with all that professed it, Acts xiii. 45, 50, xvii. 5, xviii. 6: 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16; Rom. xi. 7–10: whom, not long after, the vengeance of God overtook in their total destruction.

Now, our apostle vehemently thirsting after the salvation of the Hebrews in general, Rom. ix. 1–3, x. 1, having all these several sorts or parties to deal withal, he so frames his Epistle unto them that it might be suited to all their good, in their conversion, instruction, edification, and establishment, as their several conditions did require,—the latter sort only excepted, who, being under judicial blindness, were cast out of the care of God and his, Acts xiii. 46, 51. Hence in part is that admirable contexture of this Epistle, which Peter ascribes unto his eminent wisdom, 2 Pet. iii. 15: as it is indeed evident from the story that he did excel in

applying himself to the various principles, capacities, and prejudices, of them with whom he had to do; the Lord Christ having set him forth as a great example of that diligence, zeal, and prudence, which he requires in the dispensers of the gospel. Divine reasonings, instructions, exhortations, promises, threats, arguments, are so interwoven in this Epistle, from the beginning to the end, that all to whose hands or hearing it should come might everywhere meet with that which was of especial and immediate concernment to themselves, unto which of the sorts before mentioned soever they did belong. And this principle we must have respect unto, in that intermixture of arguments to prove the truth of the gospel with exhortations to constancy in the profession of it which we shall meet withal. The several conditions of those to whom the apostle wrote required that way of procedure. Hence no one chapter in the Epistle is purely dogmatical, the first only excepted, nor purely parenetical: for though the design that lies in view, and is never out of sight, be exhortation, yet far the greatest part of the Epistle is taken up in those doctrinals wherein the foundations of the exhortations do lie; both interwoven together, somewhat variously from the method of the same apostle in all his other epistles, as hath been observed, that to the Galatians, which is of the like nature with this, only excepted.

II. A second thing to be previously observed is, that although those to whom the apostle wrote were of the several sorts before mentioned, yet they centred in this, that they were Hebrews by birth and religion, who all agreed in some *common principles* relating to the subject he treated with them about. These he makes use of unto them all: for though the unbelieving Jews did deny, or did not yet acknowledge, that Jesus was the Christ, yet they also consented unto, or could not gainsay, what in the Old Testament was revealed concerning the person, office, dignity, and work of the Messiah when he should come; that being the faith whereby they were saved before his appearance, Acts xxvi. 6, 7. Upon these general principles, wherein they also agreed, and which were the general persuasion of the whole Judaical church, the apostle lays the foundation of all his arguments; and hence he ofttimes takes that for granted which, without this consideration, should we look on any of those to whom he writes under the general notion of unbelievers, would seem to be the thing principally in question. And therefore have we at large already manifested what was the avowed profession of the sounder part of the Judaical church in those days concerning the Messiah, which the apostle here and elsewhere, in dealing with the Jews, built upon, Acts xxvi. 22, 23, 27, xxviii. 23, xiii. 16, 17, etc.; which the reader must have constant respect unto.

III. In urging testimonies out of the Old Testament, he doth not always make use of those that seem to be most perspicuous and apposite to his purpose, but oftentimes takes others, more abstruse, obscure, and of less evident consequence, at first view; and that upon a double account:—First, That he might instruct the believers amongst them in the more abstruse prophecies of the Old Testament, and thereby incite them to the further search after Christ under the Mosaical veil and prophetical allegories whereby he is therein expressed; aiming to lead them on towards perfection, Heb. v. 12, vi. 1. Secondly, Because most of the testimonies he makes use of were generally granted by the Jews of all sorts to belong to the Messiah, his kingdom and offices; and his design was to deal with them chiefly upon their own concessions and principles. As we have some few other helps remaining to acquaint us with what was the received sense of the Judaical church concerning sundry passages in the Old Testament relating unto the promised Christ, so the paraphrases of Scripture that were either at that time in use amongst them, as was the Greek translation amongst the Hellenists, or about that time composed, as the Targums, at least some parts of them, will give us much light into it. What of that ancient sense appeareth yet, in the corrupted copies

of those translations which remain, being considered, will much evince the reason and suitableness of the apostle's quotations. And this is needful to be observed, to refute that impiety of some (as Cajetan), who, not being able to understand the force of some testimonies cited by the apostle, as to his purpose in hand, have questioned the authority of the whole Epistle; as also the mistake of Jerome, who in his epistle to Pammachius rashly affirmed that Paul did quote scriptures that were not indeed to his purpose, but out of design to stop the mouths of his adversaries, as he himself had dealt with Jovinian; which was very far from him whose only design was ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ,—to promote the truth in love.

IV. He takes it for granted, in the whole Epistle, that the Judaical church-state did yet continue, and that the worship of it was not yet disallowed of God; suitably to what was before declared concerning his own and the other apostles' practice. Had that church-state been utterly abolished, all observation of Mosaical rites, which were the worship of that church as such, had been utterly unlawful, as now it is. Neither did the determination recorded Acts xv. abolish them, as some suppose, but only free the Gentiles from their observance. Their free use was yet permitted unto the Jews, Acts xxi. 20, 22–26, xxvii. 9; and practised by Paul in particular in his Nazaritical vow, chap. xxi. 26, which was attended with a sacrifice, Num. vi. 13–21. Nor was Mosaical worship utterly to cease, so as to have no acceptance with God, until the final ruin of that church, foretold by our Saviour himself, Matt. xxiv., by Peter, 2 Epist. iii., by James also, chap. v. 6–9, and by our apostle in this Epistle, chap. x. 37; xii. 25–27, was accomplished.

Hence it is that our apostle calls the times of the gospel "The world to come," Heb. ii. 5, vi. 5,—the name whereby the Jews denoted the state of the church under the Messiah,—proper unto it only whilst the legal administrations of worship did continue. Thus, as *de facto* he had showed respect unto the person of the high priest as one yet in lawful office, Acts xxiii. 5, so *doctrinally* he takes it for granted that that office was still continued, Heb. viii. 4, 5, with the whole worship of Moses' institution, chap. xiii. 11, 12. And this dispensation of God's patience, being the last trial of that church, was continued in a proportion of time answerable to their abode in the wilderness upon its first erection; which our apostle minds them of, chap. iii. iv.

The law of Moses, then, was not actually abrogated by Christ, who observed the rules of it in the days of his flesh; nor by the apostles, who seldom used their liberty from it, leaving the use of it to the Jews still; but having done its work whereunto it was designed, and its obligation expiring, ending, and being removed or taken away, in the death and resurrection of Christ, and promulgation of the gospel that ensued thereupon, which doctrinally declared its ἀνωφελεῖαν, or uselessness, God in his providence put an end unto it as to its observation, in the utter and irrecoverable overthrow of the temple, the place designed for the solemn exercise of its worship. So did it "decay, wax old," and "vanish away," chap. viii. 13.

And this also God ordered, in his infinite wisdom, that their temple, city, and nation, and so, consequently, their whole church-state, should be utterly wasted by the pagan Romans, before the power of the empire came into the hands of men professing the name of Christ; who could neither well have suffered their temple to stand as by them abused, nor yet have destroyed it without hardening them in their impenitency and unbelief.

V. That which is proposed unto confirmation in the whole Epistle, and from whence all the inferences and exhortations insisted on do arise and are drawn, is the *excellency of the gospel*, and the worship of God therein revealed and appointed, upon the account of its manifold relation to the person and offices of Christ, the Mediator, the Son of God. Now, because those to whom it is directed did, as hath been declared, some of them adhere to Mosaical ceremonies and worship in

conjunction with the gospel, others with a preferency of them above it, and some to a relinquishment of it, especially when they once found its profession obnoxious to persecution, the apostle institutes, and at large prosecutes, a comparison between Moses' law and the gospel, as to their usefulness and excellency, in reference unto men's acceptation with God by the one and the other; as also of the spirituality, order, and beauty of the worship severally required in them. And herein, though he derogates in no respect from the law that which was justly due unto it, yet, on the accounts before mentioned, he preferreth the gospel before it; and not only so, but also manifests that as Mosaical institutions were never of any other use but to prefigure the real mediatory work of Christ, with the benefits thereof, so he being exhibited and his work accomplished, their observation was become needless, and themselves, if embraced to a neglect or relinquishment of the gospel, pernicious.

This comparison (wherein also the proof of the positive worth and excellency of the gospel is included), omitting for weighty reasons (intimated by James, Acts xxi. 21; by himself, Acts xxii. 19–21, xxiv. 14) all prefatory salutations, he enters upon in the first verses of the Epistle: and being thereby occasioned to make mention of the Messiah, from whose person and office the difference he was to insist upon did wholly arise, he spendeth the residue of the chapter in proving the divine excellency of his person and the eminency of his office, as the only king, priest, and prophet of his church; on all which the dignity of the gospel, in the profession whereof he exhorts them to persevere, doth depend.

He, then, that would come to a right understanding of this Epistle must always bear in mind,—1. *To whom it was written;* which were the Jews of the several sorts before mentioned: 2. *To what end it was written;* even to prevail with them to embrace the gospel, and to persist in the profession of it without any mixture of Mosaical observations: 3. *On what principles the apostle deals with them in this argument;* which are no other, for the most part, than what were granted by the Jews of all sorts: 4. *What testimonies out of the Old Testament he insists on to prove his purpose;* namely, such as were commonly received in the Judaical church to belong unto the Messiah and his office: 5. *What he labours to instruct them in,* as to the general use of all sorts amongst them; which is, the nature and use of Mosaical rites: 6. *The main argument he insists on,* for the ends before mentioned: which is, the excellency of the gospel, the worship instituted therein, and the righteousness manifested thereby, upon the account of its author and subject, the principal efficient cause of its worship, and only procurer of the righteousness exhibited in it, even Jesus Christ, the Messiah, Mediator,—the eternal Son of God. Unless these things are well borne in mind, and the case of the Jews particularly heeded, our Exposition will, it may be, seem ofttimes to go out of the way, though it constantly pursue the design and scope of the apostle.

VI. Though this Epistle was written unto the Hebrews, and immediately for their use, yet it is left on record in the canon of the Scripture by the Holy Ghost, for the same *general end* with the other parts of the Scripture, and the use of all believers therein to the end of the world.

This use in our Exposition is also to be regarded, and that principally in the parenetical or hortatory part of it. That, then, which is dogmatical, and the foundation of all the exhortations insisted on, may be two ways considered:—

1. Properly, as to the special and peculiar tendency of the principles and doctrines handled; and so they specially intend the Jews, and must be opened with respect to them, their principles, traditions, opinions, objections,—all which must therefore be considered, that the peculiar force and efficacy of the apostle's reasonings with respect unto them may be made manifest. And from the doctrinal part of this Epistle so opened, the exhortations that arise do chiefly respect the Jews, and are peculiarly suited unto them, their state and condition.

2. Again, the doctrines treated on by the apostle may be considered absolutely and abstractedly from the special case of the Jews, which he had in his eye,—merely as to their own nature; and so they are, many of them, of the chief, fundamental principles of the gospel. In this respect they are grounds for the application of the exhortations in the Epistle unto all professors of the gospel to the end of the world. And this must guide us in our Exposition. Having to deal with the Jews, the doctrinal parts of the Epistle must be opened with special respect unto them, or we utterly lose the apostle's aim and design; and dealing with Christians, the hortatory part shall be principally insisted on, as respecting all professors;—yet not so but that, in handling the doctrinal part, we shall weigh the principles of it, as articles of our evangelical faith in general, and consider also the peculiar respect that the exhortations have unto the Jews.

Now, whereas, as was said, many principles of the Jews are partly supposed and taken for granted, partly urged and insisted on to his own purpose by the apostle, we must in our passage make some stay in their discovery and declaration, and shall insert them under their proper heads where they occur, even as many of them as are not already handled in our Prolegomena.

III.—TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

Christian Reader,

There are but few things that I shall here detain thee in the consideration of, and those such as are necessary, if thou intendest the perusal of the ensuing Discourses. What principally concerneth this Exposition or Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, as to the design, scope, order, and method of it, was fully declared in a preface unto a former volume of Exercitations, with an exposition of the first two chapters thereof. Such as have there taken notice of them do deserve to be free from the trouble of their repetition in this place; and unto those by whom their consideration hath been omitted or neglected, either with the whole work or in the perusal of it, it is no wrong to suppose either that they need them not, or to leave them under this direction where they may be found. Wherefore I shall not offer thee any thing with respect unto the exposition of the three following chapters, which is now presented unto thee, as to its design, order, and method, which have been all before declared. Only, whereas our apostle in the third chapter digresseth unto a pathetical, rational, argumentative exhortation unto those practical duties of faith, love, constancy, and perseverance, which were the principal end of his doctrinal instructions in the whole Epistle, and indispensably necessary to be diligently attended unto by the Hebrews, under their condition and circumstances, in a singular manner; so, in imitation of and compliance with him who is my pattern and guide, as also finding the same duties, under our present circumstances, no less necessary to be singularly attended unto by all professors of the gospel, I have somewhat more largely than ordinary insisted on them, and consequently on the exposition of the chapter itself. And if any one shall hereon conceive our discourses over long or tedious, or too much diverting from the expository part of our work, I have sundry things to offer towards his satisfaction: as,—

1. The method of the whole is so disposed, as that any one, by the sole guidance of his eye, without further trouble than by turning the leaves of the book, may carry on or continue his reading of any one part of the whole without interruption or mixing any other discourses therewithal. So may he, in the first place, go

over our consideration of the original text, with the examination of ancient and modern translations, and the grammatical construction and signification of the words, without diverting unto any thing else that is discoursed on the text. In like manner, if any desire to peruse the exposition of the text and context, with the declaration and vindication of the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost in them, without the least intermixture of any practical discourses deduced from them, he may, under the same guidance, and with the same labour, confine himself thereunto from the beginning unto the end of the work. And whereas the practical observations with their improvement do virtually contain in them the sense and exposition of the words, and give light unto the intendment of the apostle in his whole design, for ought I know some may be desirous to exercise themselves principally in those discourses; which they may do by following the series and distinct continuation of them from first to last. Wherefore, from the constant observation of the same method as to the principal distinct parts of the whole Exposition, every one is at liberty to use that order in the perusal of it which he judgeth most for his own advantage.

2. There will be relief found against that discouragement which the appearing length of these discourses may give the reader, from the variety of their subject-matter or the things that are contained in them; for there are few of them on any single head that extend themselves beyond a page, or leaf at the most. Wherefore, although all of them together may make an appearance of some tediousness unto the reader, yet he will find it not easy to fix his charge on any one in particular, unless he judge it wholly impertinent; and for those few of them which much exceed the bounds mentioned, their importance will plead an excuse for their taking up so much room in the work itself. As, for instance (to confine myself unto the third chapter, the exposition whereof seems principally, if not solely, liable to this objection), the authority of Christ, as the Son of God, over the church; the nature of faith, as also of unbelief, and the danger of eternal ruin wherewith it is attended; the deceitfulness of sin, with the ways and means of the hardening the hearts of men thereby; the limitation of a day or season of grace; with the use of Old Testament types and examples, which are therein treated of by the apostle, —are things which, in their own nature, deserve a diligent inquiry into them and declaration of them. And however others, who have had only some particular design and aim in the exposition of this Epistle, or any other book of the Scripture, may satisfy themselves in opening the words of the text so far as it suits their design, yet he who professedly undertakes a full and plenary exposition cannot discharge his duty and undertaking without the interpretation and improvement of the things themselves treated of, according to the intention and mind of the Spirit of God. And I could heartily wish that the temptations and sins of the days wherein we live did not render the diligent consideration of the things mentioned more than ordinarily necessary unto all sorts of professors.

3. The reader may observe, that most of those discourses themselves do, if not consist in the exposition of other places of Scripture, suggested by their analogy unto that under consideration, yet have such expositions, with a suitable application of them, everywhere intermixed with them. Unto them to whom these things are not satisfactory with respect unto the length of these discourses, I have no more to offer, but that if they think meet, on this or any other consideration, to spare their charge in buying or their labour in reading the book itself, they will have no reason to complain with respect unto any thing contained in it or the manner of its handling.

There is one thing also peculiarly respecting the exposition of the fourth chapter, which the reader is to be acquainted withal. The doctrine of the original, confirmation, translation or change of a sabbatical day of divine worship, being declared therein, I had in its exposition continual respect unto those Exercitations

on that subject which I had published about two years ago. And indeed those Exercitations were both prepared and designed to be a part of the preliminary Discourses unto this part of our Exposition, but were forced from me by the importunate desires of some and the challenges of others to prove the divine institution of the Lord's-day sabbath. But now, finding that two editions of that book of Exercitations are dispersed, I would not consent unto the reprinting of them in this treatise, although peculiarly belonging unto the doctrine of the apostle in this chapter, that the charge of those readers who had them already might not be increased. Yet I cannot but mind the reader, that in the exposition of that passage or discourse of the apostle about the several rests mentioned in the Scripture, I will not absolutely stand to his censure and judgment upon the perusal of the Exposition alone (though I will maintain it to be true, and hope it to be clear and perspicuous), without regard unto those Exercitations, wherein the truth of the Exposition itself is largely discussed and vindicated.

Unto the whole there are tables added,—collected, I confess, in too much haste, and not digested into so convenient a method as might be desired; but those who are acquainted with my manifold infirmities, not to mention other occasions, employments, and diversions, will not, perhaps, too severely charge upon me such failures in accuracy, and other effects of strength and leisure, as might otherwise be expected. And as for those unto whom my circumstances are unknown, I shall not concern myself in their censures any further than I am convinced of the weight of those reasons whereon they are grounded, and the importance of the matter about which they are exercised: for if such censures be either rash and precipitate, without a due examination of all that belongs unto what they reflect upon; if they openly savour of malevolence or envy; if they are about things of small moment, such as wherein neither the truth, nor reasonableness, nor soundness of the discourses themselves are concerned, or be such as might possibly, in a work of this nature and length, escape a commendable diligence,—let them be expressed in words of the highest disdain, the design of their authors will be utterly frustrate, if they intend the least disquietment unto my mind or thoughts about them, nor will, I suppose, be very successful with any persons of learning or ingenuity whom they shall endeavour to leaven thereby. Much less shall I be moved with the vain reproaches of any, however expressed in words suited to expose either my person, or endeavours in this kind to serve the church of Christ, unto contempt and scorn; not only because I am forewarned to look for such entertainment in the world, and instructed how to deport myself under it, but also because I have had a full experience of an absolute contrary event unto what hath been designed in them.

I have not more to add concerning the ensuing Exposition; for to give the reader a particular account either of my travail therein or of the means used in its carrying on, beyond what I have mentioned in the preface unto the preceding volume, I judge not convenient, as not willing to give the least appearance of any satisfaction, much less glorying, in any thing of my own but my infirmities, as I neither do, nor desire, nor dare to do. This only duty binds me to declare, that as I used the utmost sincerity whereof I am capable in the investigation and declaration of the mind of the Spirit of God in the text, without the least respect unto any parties of men, opinions, ways of worship, or other differences that are amongst us in and about the affairs of religion, because I feared God; so in the issue and product of my endeavours, the reader will find nothing savouring of an itch after novelty or curiosity, nothing that will divert him from that sound doctrine and form of wholesome words wherein the professors of this nation have been educated and instructed.

For the Exercitations premised unto the Exposition, I must acknowledge that I have not been able to compass the whole of what I did design. Not only continued indisposition as to health, but frequent relapses into dangerous distempers,

forced the utmost of my endeavours to give place unto them for a season, and to take off my hand from that work before I had finished the whole of what I aimed at: for it was in my purpose to have pursued the tradition, and given an account of sacrifices with priests for their offering; as also the occasions, rise, and discharge of the office of the priesthood among the principal nations of the world during the state of Gentilism, and their apostasy from God therein. Moreover, what doth concern the person and priesthood of Melchizedek I had designed as a part of this work and undertaking; and I had also purposed an historical account of the succession and actings of the high priests among the Jews from the institution of their office unto its dissolution: all which belong unto the illustration of that office which, as vested in Jesus Christ, is the subject of these discourses. These things, with others of the like nature, I have been forced, for the reasons mentioned, to reserve unto another part of this work, if God shall be pleased to give life, strength, and opportunity for the finishing of it, which may be no less seasonable; for although they do all, as was said, belong unto the illustration of the priestly office and its administration, yet the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ is complete without them. Let not, therefore, the reader suppose that on this occasion our Exercitations concerning the priesthood of Christ are imperfect or defective as to the subject-matter of them, as though any thing materially belonging thereunto were left undiscussed; although other imperfections and defects, it is most probable, they may be justly charged withal. And I shall only say concerning them, that as it is wholly without the compass of my knowledge and conjecture, if the reader can find any by whom the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ hath been so handled, in its proper order and method, as to its original, causes, nature, and effects; so for the truth that is taught concerning it, and its discharge unto the benefit and salvation of the church, I shall, God assisting, be accountable for it unto any by whom it shall be called into question.

The greatest opposition that ever was made among Christians unto the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, or rather unto the office itself, is that which at this day is managed by the Socinians. It is therefore manifest, and, as I suppose, will be confessed by all who inquire into these things, that I could not answer my design, of the full declaration of it, unto the edification of the present church, without an accurate discussion of their sentiments about it, and opposition unto it. This, therefore, was so necessary unto the occasion, that my undertaking an express examination and refutation of their principles in this matter is no way liable unto any just exception. Only, it may seem inconvenient unto some, that, in a discourse of this nature, the discussion of the writings of particular men, as Enjedinus, Socinus, Smalcius, Crellius, and others, should be so much insisted on; and I must acknowledge that at first it seemed unto myself not altogether suited unto the nature of my design. But second thoughts inclined me unto this course; for it is known unto them who are any way exercised in these things, with how many artifices this sort of men do palliate their opinions, endeavouring to insinuate contrary and adverse principles under and by those words, phrases of speech, and expressions, whereby the truth is declared. Wherefore, if any one shall charge them with what is indeed their mind and judgment in these things, he may sometimes be thought unduly to impose upon them what they do not own, yea, what their words seem expressly to free them from. For instance, suppose that it should be reflected as a crime on them, that they deny the priestly office of Christ itself,—deny that he was ever a priest on earth, or yet is so in heaven,—deny that he offered himself a perfect expiatory sacrifice unto God, or that he maketh intercession for us; those who are less wary and circumspect, or less exercised in these controversies, might possibly, on the consideration of their words and profession, suspect that this charge must needs be very severe, if not highly injurious: for nothing occurs more frequently in their writings, than a fair mention of the sacerdotal office of

Christ and his expiatory sacrifice. What way, therefore, remained in this case, to state a right judgment in this controversy, but a particular discussion of what their principal authors and leaders, with great agreement among themselves, do teach in this matter? And if from thence it do appear, that what they call the sacerdotal office of Christ is indeed no such office, nor any thing that holds the least analogy with what is properly so called; and that what they term his expiatory sacrifice and his intercession is neither sacrifice nor intercession, nor hath the least resemblance of what is so indeed; the principal difficulty which lieth in our contest with them is despatched out of our way. And herein,—that none might suspect that advantages have been sought against them, by undue collections of passages out of their writings, or a misrepresentation of their sense and intentions,—it was necessary they should be heard to speak for themselves, and their own words at large, without alteration or diminution, be represented unto the reader; and this is done so fully, out of their principal authors, as that I dare say with some confidence, there is nothing in the writings of the whole party, of any importance in this cause, which is not strictly examined. And the reader is desired to observe, that if the truth which we profess concerning this office of Christ, and his discharge thereof, be sufficiently confirmed and vindicated, all the other notions of these men, concerning a metaphorical redemption, a metaphorical sacrifice, and the like, do vanish and disappear. So that although I intend, if God will, and I live, a full declaration of the true nature of the sacrifice of Christ, and the vindication of the doctrine of the church of God concerning it, I must take it for granted, that, whilst what we have asserted and confirmed concerning his priesthood remains unshaken, the whole truth relating thereunto will not only easily but necessarily follow: and what in these discourses is effected towards that end, is left to the judgment of the learned and candid reader. Besides, I thought it not unmeet to give a specimen of the way and manner whereby this sort of men do manage their opposition unto the principal truths and mysteries of the gospel, that such as are less conversant and exercised in their writings, may be cautioned against those sophistical artifices whereby they endeavour to inveigle and infect the minds or imaginations of men; for this is their peculiar excellency (or call it what you will), that, under an appearance and pretence of perspicuity, clearness, and reason, they couch the most uncouth senses, and most alien from the common reason of mankind, that can possibly fall under the imagination of persons pretending to the least sobriety. Instances hereof, and those undeniable, the reader will find in the ensuing discourses plentifully produced and discovered.

I have only further to advertise the reader, that whereas, by reason of my absence from it, many mistakes and errors have escaped the press, especially in the Exercitations, and those the most of them corrupting the sense of the words or places which they have befallen,—some whereof I have, in a cursory view of the whole, collected,—I must entreat his favour, that the failure of others may not be imputed unto me, nor any thing be interpreted to be my neglect, which, being duly considered, gives its own account to have been the effect of the want of skill or diligence in others.

JOHN OWEN.

September 30, 1673.

IV.—THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

I HAVE so fully, in my former discourses on this subject, declared the general design, scope, and end of this Epistle, the proper way and means of its interpretation, with the method of the present Exposition, which is the same throughout, that I shall not at all here detain the reader with a renewed declaration of any of

them. Only, some few things, which immediately concern that part of the Exposition which is now presented unto him, and my labour therein, may be mentioned (as I suppose) unto some usefulness:—

1. And it may not be amiss, in the first place, to take notice of an objection the present endeavour seems liable and obnoxious unto; and this is, the unseasonableness of it. We live in times that are fortified against the use of discourses of this nature, especially such as are so long and bulky. The world, and the minds of men therein, are filled with disorder and confusion; and the most are at their wits' end with looking after the things that are come, and coming, on the earth. They have enough to do in hearing, telling, and reading, real or pretended news of public affairs, so as to divert them from engaging their time and industry in the perusal and study of such discourses. Besides, there is not any thing in this now published to condite it unto the palate of the present age,—in personal contests and reflections, in pleading for or against any party of men or especial way in the profession of religion; only the fundamental truths of the gospel are occasionally contended for. These and the like considerations might possibly, in the judgment of some, have shut up this whole discourse in darkness, upon the account of its being unseasonable.

I shall briefly acquaint the reader with what relieved me against this objection, and gave me satisfaction in the publishing of this part of the Exposition after it was finished. For I could not but remember that the times and seasons wherein the former parts of it were published were very little more settled and quiet than are these which are now urgent on us; yet did not this hinder but they have been of some use and benefit unto the church of God in this nation, and others also. And who knows but this may have the same blessing accompanying of it? He who hath supplied seed to the sower, can multiply the seed sown and increase the fruits of it; and although at present the most are really unconcerned in things of this nature, yet not a few, from many parts both at home and abroad, have earnestly solicited the continuation of the Exposition, at least unto that period whereunto it is arrived.

Besides, in labours and endeavours of this nature, respect is not had merely unto the present generation, especially as many are filled with prejudices and causeless enmity against the author of them. We have ourselves more benefit and advantage by the writings of sundry persons in former ages, than they received by them who lived in their own days.

"Pascitur in vivis livor, post fata quiescit."

It is therefore the duty of some in every age to commit over, unto those that shall survive in the church of God and profession of the truth, their knowledge in the mysteries of the gospel; whereby spiritual light may be more and more increased unto the perfect day.

On these and the like considerations I have wholly left these times and seasons in His hand who hath the sole disposal of them; and will not so far observe the present blustering wind and clouds as not to sow this seed, or despair of reaping fruits thereby.

2. The reader will find no Exercitations prefixed unto this volume, as there are unto the former. And this is so fallen out, not because there were no things of weight or moment occurring in these chapters deserving a separate, peculiar handling and consideration, but for other reasons, which made the omission of them necessary and unavoidable; for indeed continued infirmities and weaknesses, in my near approach unto the grave, rendered me insufficient for that labour, especially considering what other duties have been, and yet are, incumbent on me. And yet also my choice was compliant with this necessity; for I found that this part of the Exposition comprising so many chapters, and those all of them filled with glorious

mysteries, and things of the highest importance unto our faith and obedience, would arise unto a greatness disproportionate unto the former, had it been accompanied with the like Exercitations. Whereas, therefore, I foresaw from the beginning that they must be omitted, I did treat somewhat more fully of those things which should have been the subject of them than otherwise the nature of an Exposition doth require. Such are the person and office of Melchizedek; the nature of the Aaronical priesthood, and of the priesthood of Christ as typed thereby; the framing of the tabernacle, with all its vessels and utensils, with their use and signification; the solemnity of the covenant made at Sinai, with the difference between the two covenants, the old and the new; the manner of the service of the high priest on the day of expiation, with his entrance into the most holy place; the cessation, expiration, or abrogation, of the first covenant, with all the services thereunto belonging; with sundry other things of the like importance. Whereas, therefore, these must have been the subject of such Exercitations as might have been prefixed unto this part of the Exposition, the reader will find them handled somewhat at large in the respective places wherein they do occur in the Epistle itself.

3. Concerning the subject-matter of these chapters I desire the reader to take notice,—

(1.) That the whole substance of the doctrinal part of the Epistle is contained in them; so as that there is nothing of difficulty, in the whole case managed by the apostle, but is largely treated of in these chapters.

(2.) That they do contain a full declaration of that "mystery which from the beginning of the world was hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ;" to the intent that even unto the "principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." In particular,—

[1.] The wisdom and grace of God in the constitution and making of the covenant at Sinai; in the institution of all the worship and divine services thereunto belonging; in the holy fabrics, offerings, and sacrifices of the priests and church of Israel,—are declared and manifested therein: for all these things in themselves were carnal, and so used by the generality of the people, in a way unworthy of the wisdom and holiness of God; but the apostle declares and makes it evident, in these chapters, that, in the design and intention of God, they had all of them an end and use far more glorious than what appeared in their outward administration; as also what intimations God made unto the church of this end of them, and his intention in them.

[2.] There is therefore, in these chapters, an absolute, infallible interpretation of the whole Law; without which it would be a sealed book, and of no use unto us. But as the intention and mind of God in those legal institutions is here declared, there is nothing in the whole Scripture that tends more to the illumination of our minds, and the strengthening of our faith, than doth the law of these institutions, as is manifested on all occasions in our Exposition. By virtue hereof, there is not the meanest Christian believer but doth, or may, understand more of the books of Exodus and Leviticus; see more of the wisdom, holiness, and grace of God in them; and know more of the nature and use of these legal institutions, not only than all the present Jews and their teachers, but than was ever distinctly known in the church of Israel of old.

(3.) The wisdom, righteousness, and faithfulness of God, in the removal of the old covenant, with all the services thereunto belonging, are herein abundantly vindicated. This is the stone of stumbling unto this day to all the Jews; this they quarrel and contend with God and man about, seeming to be resolved that if they may not enjoy their old institutions, they will part with and leave even God himself. Neither indeed is it God, but a shadow of their old carnal ordinances,

which at present they cleave unto, worship, and adore. Wherefore the apostle, by all sorts of arguments, doth in these chapters manifest that, before them, under them, by them, in them, God by various ways taught the church that they were not to be continued, that they were never appointed for their own sakes, that they only fore-signified the introduction of a better and more perfect church-state than what they could attain unto or be of use in; as also, that their very nature was such as rendered them obnoxious unto a removal in the appointed season; yea, he demonstrates that, without their abolition, God could never have accomplished the design of his love and grace towards the church which he had declared in his promises from the foundation of the world: and this absolutely determined the controversy between the two churches, that of the old and that of the new testament, with their different worship and services, which was then a matter of fierce contention in the whole world. Wherefore,—

(4.) The work of the apostle, in these chapters, is to show the harmony between the law and the gospel, their different ends and uses; to take off all seeming repugnancy and contradiction between them; to declare the same grace, truth, and faithfulness of God in them both, notwithstanding their inconsistent institutions of divine worship: nay, he makes it evident not only that there is a harmony between them, but also an utter impossibility that either of them should be true or proceed from God without the other.

(5.) Herein a glorious account is given of the representation that was made of the person and incarnation of Christ, with the whole office of his mediation, according as it was granted unto the church in its infant state. Some have called it the infant state of Christ as unto his incarnation, and affirmed that the ceremonies of the law were as his swaddling bands. But things are quite otherwise. The glorious state of Christ and his office is represented unto the church in its infant state, when it had no apprehension of spiritual things but such as children have of the objects of reason. In particular, how the ancient church was instructed in the nature and blessed efficacy of his sacrifice, the foundation of its salvation, is made gloriously to appear.

(6.) Directions are given herein unto all unto whom the gospel is preached, or by whom it is professed, how to behave themselves as unto what God requireth of them, expressed in clear instructions and pathetical exhortations, accompanied with glorious promises on the one hand, and severe threatenings on the other. Scarcely in the whole Book of God [is there] such an exact description of the nature and work of faith, the motives unto it and advantages of it; of the deceitful actings of unbelief, with the ways of its prevalency in the minds and over the souls of men; of the end of true believers on the one hand, and of hypocrites and apostates on the other,—as is in this discourse of the apostle. Such a graphical description and account of these things is given us in the sixth chapter and the latter part of the tenth, as cannot but greatly affect the minds of all who are spiritually enlightened to behold things of this nature. A blessed glass is represented unto us, wherein we may see the true image and portraiture of believers and unbelievers,—their different ways, actings, and ends.

In the whole there is made a most holy revelation and representation of the wisdom of God, of the glory of Christ, of the mystery of grace in the recovery of fallen man and the salvation of the church, with the future judgment; so as that they have a greater lustre, light, and glory in them, unto such as have the eyes of their understandings opened to behold spiritual things, than is in the sun shining in its strength and beauty unto the eyes of flesh,—unto which it is sweet and pleasant to behold the light.

These are the holy sayings of God, the glorious discoveries of himself and his grace,—the glass wherein we may behold the glory of Christ, until we are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory.

What, in the exposition of these things and others of an alike nature. God hath enabled me to attain unto, is left unto the use of the church, and the judgment of every learned, pious, and candid reader.

J. OWEN.

LONDON, *April* 17, 1680.

V.—THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

ALTHOUGH the Lord took the reverend and learned author of the ensuing Exposition unto himself before it could be published, yet, he having finished it before his death, and made it ready for the press, the importunity of some worthy persons, who well knew of what great use and benefit the former parts of it have been unto the church of God, hath brought this forth unto the light; so that *now* the world is furnished with a most complete Exposition on this mysterious Epistle.

Many eminent and learned men, I must and do acknowledge, have written on this subject; but this excellent person, who has not only critically, and with much judgment, examined every word and phrase of the writer, comparing every quotation with those places in the Old Testament from whence they were taken, but has also considered the design of the apostle that wrote it, the time wherein and proper ends for which it was composed, the principles proceeded upon, and the manner of arguing, has made this Exposition more *full*, more *exact*, more *profitable* and *advantageous*, than those of others, who have not (that I can find) taken the same acute notice of the scope of the words and nature of the argument as this doctor hath done.

This Epistle being writ unto the Hebrews, the apostle accommodates his discourse unto them; and, knowing what their persuasions were about the Messiah, what their prejudices, customs, and traditions, he so tempers his writings as to obviate all their objections and solve their doubts. Upon which account an exact commentary became a work insuperable to any but such a one as was well acquainted with the principles and customs of the Jews: but this reverend author, being thoroughly enriched with rabbinic learning, had the advantage above others; which he has improved for the church's edification.

It is no part of my business, at this time, to enlarge in acquainting the reader with the several excellencies of this great person; for seeing this Exposition, and his other Discourses already published, carry on them many marks and signatures of great learning, profound judgment, and exemplary piety, the waiving it for the present may be with the less regret. And yet, I cannot but observe what seems peculiar to him in his writings, and it is this:—his chief design in them appears to be, not only a defence of the most substantial doctrines of Christian religion, but, moreover, a display of the infinite wisdom and glorious grace of God contained in them. He writes as one who had on his soul a deep sense of sin, and of our lost estate by nature; and it is his care to show where a convinced sinner may find relief, while he stands bound in conscience to an appearance before the tribunal of a righteous God.

What must those do for justification, who, when before their Judge, must in the first place confess their guilt? The Judge of all the earth cannot but do right; and therefore can by no means justify any but on consideration of a righteousness that answers the same law by which we are to be judged. And where is such a righteousness to be found by those who have transgressed that law? Certainly nowhere but in the Lord Jesus Christ, God-man, made an high priest after the order of Melchizedek: for which reason this author has made it the burden of his

studies to explicate and unfold the deep mysteries of the gospel touching this most important doctrine of justification by the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ; which he has vindicated from the opposition that hath been laid in against it by the Arminian and Socinian on the one hand, and the Antinomian on the other. In doing which, he has shown the agreement there is between the sacred Scriptures and the real Christian's experiences, to the unspeakable satisfaction and comfort of many doubting souls.

And thus much may be seen not only in those Discourses already published, especially in that excellent treatise of Justification, and the former parts of this Exposition, but in this part that is now presented to the reader's view; in which I observe,—

1. That whereas the apostle, in the foregoing chapters, made it his endeavour to fix the minds of the Hebrews in the truth of the gospel, and to encourage them to constancy and perseverance therein, notwithstanding the many temptations arising from the consideration of the Judaical church-state itself, by which they were assaulted, he doth in these chapters enter on the *application;* and considering the temptations unto which they were exposed, through the rage and severe persecutions they were like to meet with from the obstinate Jews, he declares unto them the only way and means, on their part, whereby they may be preserved and kept constant unto the end. And this is *faith;* on which though the apostle treats largely, yet not as *justifying*, but as it is *efficacious* and operative in them that are justified with respect unto perseverance. Wherefore,—

2. One part of the work of the apostle, is to show the great effects that have been, from the beginning of the world, wrought by faith: how that Abel and the other antediluvian patriarchs; that Noah, and all the fathers from him until Abraham's being called out of Ur of the Chaldees; that Abraham, and all the old believers until the coming of the Lord Christ in the flesh,—lived on the same principle of faith that Christians now do; and that this their faith was the comfort and support of their souls in all their sufferings, and may therefore be considered as an eminent encouragement unto us to abide in the profession of the same faith, notwithstanding all the difficulties and persecutions we may meet withal. Yea, further,—

3. The apostle in these chapters ascends unto Him who is "the author and finisher of our faith," proposing him both as our example and the object of our faith, from whom we may expect aid and assistance for conformity unto himself; "who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, and despised the shame." Besides,—

4. The apostle in these chapters doth add several arguments, for confirmation of his exhortation unto patience, and for the strengthening them against faintings under the chastisements of their heavenly Father. He warns them against several sins; and gives them a brief scheme of the two states of the law and gospel, balancing them one against another, showing the excellency and glory of the grace of God in Christ as extended unto convinced sinners, and from thence enforceth his exhortation to perseverance. And,—

5. That the Hebrews may be established in the truth of the gospel, the apostle urgeth the necessity of one altar and sacrifice, and proves the Lord Christ to be both our altar and sacrifice; whereupon now there is no place left for the Mosaical ceremonies. A new state of religion, answerable unto the nature of the altar and sacrifice, is introduced, unto which alone we must adhere; for at the same time none can have an interest in two altars of such different natures, and attended with such different religious observations.

These are the chief points treated on in this last part of the Epistle; in which the divine wisdom of the apostle manifests itself in the intermixture of evangelical mysteries with pathetical exhortations and glorious promises to those who, not-

withstanding the rage of the persecutor, abide faithful to the profession of the faith.

And the reverend and learned author of this Exposition has, with wonderful accuracy and exactness, explained the most difficult parts of it; and thereby hath given the reader a light, by the help of which he may see through all the Socinian glosses that have been cast on the text by Crellius, Grotius, and others.

But I shall no longer detain the reader from the perusal of the ensuing Exposition; which that it may be a great soul benefit and advantage to him, is the hearty desire of

H. G.

EXERCITATIONS

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

EXERCITATION I.

THE CANONICAL AUTHORITY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

1. The canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. Notation of the word קָנֶה, "kaneh;" a measuring reed; the beam of a balance. 3. Thence κανών, of the same signification. 4. Metaphorically a moral rule—"Rectum" and "canon," how far the same—The Scripture a rule—Canonical. 5. The antiquity of that appellation. 6. The canon of the Scripture. 7. What required to render a book canonical—All books of the holy Scripture equal as to their divine original. 8. Jews' distinction of the books of the Old Testament, as to the manner of their writing, disproved. 9. All equally canonical—No book canonical of a second sort or degree. 10. The Epistle to the Hebrews canonical. 11. Opposed by heretics of old. 12. Not received into the Latin church until the days of Jerome. 13. Proved against Baronius. 14. Not rejected by any of that church; 15. Only not publicly approved—The church of Rome not the sole proposer of books canonical. 16. Occasions of its non-admittance at Rome—Boldness of some in rejecting and corrupting the Scripture. 17. By whom this Epistle opposed of late. 18. The objection of the uncertainty of the penman answered. 19. Citations out of the Old Testament not found therein—Answer. 20. Citations not to his purpose—Answer. 21. Countenance to old heresies—Answer. 22. General heads of arguments to prove its canonical authority—Characters to discover between books of divine inspiration and others—Γνώμη—Φράσεως χαρακτὴρ—Προαίρεσις. 23. The general argument of books truly canonical. 24. Subject-matter; 25. Design; 26. Style. 27. Of the style of the sacred writers. 28. Mistakes of many about it. 29. The nature of eloquence. 30. Excellency of Scripture style; 31. Energy; 32. Authority; and 33. Efficacy. 34. Tradition concerning the authority of this Epistle—Not justly liable to any exceptions—35. From the author; 36. Circumstances; 37. Subject-matter; 38. Style. 39. Testimonies. 40. Conclusion.

1. THE *canonical authority* of the Epistle unto the Hebrews having been by some called into question, we must in our entrance declare both what it is which we intend thereby, as also the clear interest of this Epistle therein; for this is the foundation of all those

ensuing discourses from it and of that exposition of it which we intend.

2. The Greek word κανών, which gives rise unto that term "canonical," seems to be derived from the Hebrew קָנֶה, "kaneh:" and this, as it sometimes denotes an aromatical cane that contained spices in it, used in the worship of God (as Isa. xliii. 24, לֹא־קָנִיתָ קָנֶה, "Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with silver;" for this קָנֶה הַטּוֹב, "precious cane," growing not in their own country, was brought from afar off, Jer. vi. 20); so in general it signifies any reed whatever, 1 Kings xiv. 15, Isa. xlii. 3: whence a multitude of fierce and wicked men, compared to the devouring crocodile, whose lurking-place is in the canes or reeds, are termed חַיַּת קָנֶה, "The beasts of the reeds," Ps. lxviii. 30. Particularly, it signifies a reed made into an instrument wherewith they measured their buildings, containing six cubits in length, Ezek. xl. 7, xlii. 16; and hence indefinitely it is taken for a rule or a measure. Besides, it signifies the "jugum," or "scapus," or beam, with the tongue, of a balance, keeping the poise of the scales equal, and discovering the rectitude or declension thereof: Isa. xlvi. 6, כֶּסֶף בַּקָּנֶה יִשְׁקֹלוּ, "They weigh silver on the cane,"—that is, saith the Targum, במאזניא, "in the balance;" the supporter and director of the scales being put for the whole. The rabbins call it קנה של מאזנים, "The reed of the scales,"—that which tries, and weighs, and gives every thing its just moment.

3. And this also is the first and proper signification of the Greek word κανών, "canon." So the scholiast on that of Aristophanes,

Καὶ κανόνας ἐξοίσουσι, καὶ πήχεις ἐπῶν,[1]

tells us that κανών is κυρίως τὸ ἐπάνω τῆς τρυτάνης ὂν καὶ εἰς ἰσότητα ταύτην ἄγον, "properly that which is over the scales, bringing them" (and the things weighed in them) "to equality;" the very same with the Hebrew קָנֶה, from which it is derived. So Varinus tells us that it is properly the "tongue in the balance," and in use μέτρον ἀδιάψευστον. Thus Aristotle says, Τῷ εὐθεῖ καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ κάμπυλον γινώσκομεν, κριτὴς γὰρ ἀμφοῖν ὁ κανών·—"By that which is right we know itself, and that which is crooked, for the canon is judge of both;"[2] where he useth the word for any kind of rule or measure, answering unto the other signification of "kaneh" in the Hebrew. "Rectum" and "canon," that which is *right*, and the *rule*, are one and the same, —the one expression denoting the nature of any thing, the other its use and application.

4. From this original, proper importance of the word is its *metaphorical* use deduced, which is most common; and therein it signifies a *moral rule*, or a measure for direction, trial, and judgment. Hence the philosopher calls the law Κανόνα τῆς πολιτείας, "The rule of the

[1] Aristoph. in Ran. Ac. iii. Sc. 1, v. 799. [2] Aristot. de Anim. lib. i. cap. ult.

administration,"[1] or government of the commonwealth,—that whereby all the parts of it are disposed into their proper places, whereby they are regulated and all things done in it are tried and judged. And in this sense it is applied by St Paul unto divine revelation, Gal. vi. 16, Ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν,—"As many as proceed orderly," that is, in a direct way (for so στοιχεῖν denotes), "according to this rule" or canon. And to the same purpose he useth again the same expression, Phil. iii. 16; for as the words of the Scripture are in themselves דִּבְרֵי אֱמֶת, "words of truth," so the writing itself is כָּתוּב יֹשֶׁר, "a right writing;" or, as the LXX., γεγραμμένον εὐθύτητος, "that which is written in uprightness," to be a rule and judge unto all. Εὐθύτητος is *genitivus adjuncti*, not *materiæ*, declaring the *property* of the writing, not the *subject-matter;* that is, it is canonical: for τὸ εὐθές and κανών, that which is *right*, and a *rule*, we have showed to be the same. And from hence it is that the Scripture, or written word of God, being in itself every way absolutely right and perfect, and appointed by him to be the rule or canon of the church's faith and obedience, requiring, trying, regulating, judging wholly and absolutely of them, is come κατ' ἐξοχήν, by way of eminency, to be called "canonical" or regular; as the book wherein it is contained is called "The Bible," though in itself that be the common name of all books.

5. And this appellation is of ancient use in the church. The synod of Laodicea, supposed to have preceded the council of Nice, makes mention of it as a thing generally admitted; for the fathers of it decree, Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἀκανόνικα βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς Καινῆς καὶ Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης,—"That no private psalms ought to be said or read in the church, nor any uncanonical books, but only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament,"[2] whose names they subjoin in their order. And some while before, the bishops who joined with the church of Antioch in the deposition of Paulus Samosatenus charged him as ὁ ἀποστὰς τοῦ κανόνος,[3]—one that, in the introduction of his heresy, departed from the canon or rule of the Scripture. Before them, also, it was called by Irenæus, Κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινής.[4] And Chrysostom calls it, Τῶν θείων νόμων ἀπόφασιν, "The sentence of the divine laws;" Ἀκριβῆ ζυγὸν ἁπάντων καὶ γνώμονα καὶ κανόνα, "The exact balance, square, or rule and canon, of all truths and duties;"[5] wherein he hath evidently respect unto the original use and importance of the word, before explained: and thereupon calls on his hearers, that, omitting the consideration of what this or that man says or thinks, they should seek and require ταῦτα ἅπαντα παρὰ τῶν

[1] Aristot. Pol. lib. ii. cap. viii. [2] Concil. Laod. can. lix. [3] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vii. cap. xxx. [4] Iren. lib. iv. cap. lxix. [5] Chrysost. in 2 ad Cor. cap. vi. ad finem.

γραφῶν, "all these things of (or from) the Scriptures," which are the canon of our faith and obedience. And Austin: "Demonstrent ecclesiam suam, non in rumoribus Africorum, sed in præscripto Legis, in Prophetarum prædictis, in Psalmorum cantibus; hoc est, in omnibus canonicis sanctorum librorum auctoritatibus;"—"Let them demonstrate their church, not by the rumours of the Africans, but by the prescription of the Law, the predictions of the Prophets, the songs of the Psalms; that is, by the canonical authority of the holy books of the Scriptures."[1] And he pursues the metaphor of a scale and a measure in many words elsewhere.[2] And thus Aquinas himself confesseth the Scripture is called canonical, because it is the *rule* of our understanding in the things of God;[3] and such a rule it is as hath authority over the consciences of men, to bind them unto faith and obedience, because of its being given of God by inspiration for that purpose.

6. Moreover, as the Scripture, upon the accounts mentioned, is, by way of eminency, said to be *canonical*, so there is also a *canon* or *rule* determining what books in *particular* do belong unto the holy Scripture, and to be on that account *canonical*. So Athanasius tells us, that by the holy Scripture he intends "libros certo canone comprehensos,"—"the books contained in the assured canon of it."[4] And Rufinus having reckoned up those books, concludes: "Hi sunt quos patres intra canonem concluserunt;"—"These are they which the fathers have concluded to be in the canon;"[5] that is, to belong unto the *canonical* books of Scripture. And Austin to the same purpose: "Non sine causa tam salubri vigilantia canon ecclesiasticus constitutus est, ad quem certi prophetarum et apostolorum libri pertinerent;"—"Not without good reason is the ecclesiastical canon determined by wholesome diligence, unto which certain books of the prophets and apostles should belong."[6] About the assignation of this canon of the Scripture, or what books belong unto the canonical Scripture, there have been some differences in the church since the time of the synod of Carthage, confirmed by that in Trulla at Constantinople; the first church having agreed well enough about them, excepting the *hesitation* of some few persons in reference unto one or two of them of the New Testament.

7. From this rise and use of the word, it is evident what is intended by the "canonical authority of the Scripture," or of any particular book thereunto belonging. Two things are included in that expression;—first, The *spring* and *original* of any book, which gives it authority; and, secondly, The *design* and *end* of it, which renders it canonical. For the first, it is required that it be θεό-

[1] August. de Unitat. Eccles. cap. xvi. [2] Lib. ii. de Bap. ad Donat. cap. vi. [3] Aquin. in 1 Tim. vi. lec. 1. [4] Athanas. in Synops. [5] Ruf. Exposit. Symb. Apostol. [6] August. ad Crescon. lib. ii. cap. xxxi.

πνευστος,—given by immediate inspiration from God. Without this no book or writing can by any means, any acceptation or approbation of the church, any usefulness, any similitude of style or manner of writing unto the books that are so, any conformity in matter or doctrine to them, have an interest in that *authority* that should lay a foundation for its reception into the canon. It is the impress of *the authority of God himself* on any writing, or its proceeding *immediately* from him, that is sufficient for this purpose. Neither yet will this *alone* suffice to render any revelation or writing absolutely canonical in the sense explained. There may be an especial revelation from God, or a writing by his inspiration, like that sent by Elijah unto Jehoram the king of Judah, 2 Chron. xxi. 12, which being referred only unto some *particular occasion*, and having thence authority for some especial end and purpose, yet being not designed for a *rule* of faith and obedience unto the church, may not belong unto the canon of the Scripture. But when unto the original of divine inspiration this end also is added, that it is *designed by the Holy Ghost for the catholic, standing use and instruction of the church*, then any writing or book becomes absolutely and completely canonical.

8. The Jews of later ages assign some difference among the books of the Old Testament as to their *spring* and *original*, or *manner* of revelation, though they make none as to their being all canonical.[1] The Book of the Law they assign unto a peculiar manner of revelation, which they call פה אל פה, or פנים אל פנים, "mouth to mouth," or "face to face," which they gather from Num. xii. 8; whereof afterwards. Others of them they affirm to proceed from נבואה, or the "gift of prophecy:" whereof as they make many kinds or *degrees*, taken from the *different means* used by God in the application of himself unto them, belonging to the πολυτροπία of divine revelation, mentioned by the apostle, Heb. i. 1, so they divide those books into two parts, namely, the נביאים ראשנים, or "former Prophets," containing most of the historical books after the end of the Law; and נביאים אחרונים, the "latter Prophets," wherein they comprise the most of them peculiarly so called. The original of the remainder of them they ascribe unto רוח הקדוש, or "inspiration by the Holy Ghost," calling them peculiarly כתובים, "written," by that inspiration; as though the whole canon and system of the books were not כתובה, the "scripture" or writing, and θεοπνευστία, or "divine inspiration," the only means of their writing. But they do herein as in many other things.

The distribution of the books of the Old Testament into the *Law*, *Psalms*, and *Prophets*, was very ancient in their church. We have mention of it Luke xxiv. 44: Τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ Μωσέως, καὶ Προφήταις, καὶ Ψαλμοῖς·—"That are written in the Law of Moses, and in

[1] Maimon. More Nebuch. p. ii. cap. lii.; Kimchi Præf. ad Ps.

the Prophets, and in the Psalms;" that is, in the whole canonical Scripture. And evident it is that this distribution is taken from the *subject-matter* of those principal parts of it. This reason of that distribution, which they have by tradition, they not knowing or neglecting, have feigned the rise of it in a different manner of revelation, and cast the particular books arbitrarily under what heads they pleased; as is evident from sundry of them which they reckon unto the כתובים, "Kethubim," or "Hagiographa," which are with them of least esteem. But we have a more sure rule, both *overthrowing* that *feigned distinction* and perfectly *equalizing* all parts of divine Scripture, as to their *spring* and *original.* St Peter calls the whole, Προφητικὸν λόγον, 2 Pet. i. 19, "The word of prophecy;" and Προφητείαν, ver. 20, "Prophecy:" and therefore it belongs not unto any peculiar part of it to be given out by prophecy, which is an affection [that is, a property] of the whole. And St Paul also terms the whole Scripture, Γραφαὶ προφητικαί, Rom. xvi. 26, "Prophetical scriptures," or writings of the prophets. And when he demanded of Agrippa whether he believed the Scriptures, he did it in the same manner: Πιστεύεις τοῖς Προφήταις; Acts xxvi. 27;—"Believest thou the Prophets?" that is, the Scriptures written by the Spirit of prophecy, or by the inspiration τοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεύματος Χριστοῦ, 1 Pet. i. 11, of "the Spirit of Christ which was in them." God of old spake ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, Heb. i. 1, in his revelation of himself unto them and in them, and *equally spake,* διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγιῶν τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν, Luke i. 70, unto them "by the mouth of his holy prophets from the beginning." And thus not this or that part; but πᾶσα Γραφὴ θεόπνευστος, 2 Tim. iii. 16, "all Scripture was given by inspiration." And herein all the parts or books of it are absolutely equal, and in the giving out of the whole, ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐλάλησαν οἱ ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, 2 Pet. i. 21, "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." So that whatever *different means* God at any time might make use of in the communication of his mind and will unto any of the prophets or penmen of the Scripture, it was this θεοπνευστία, and being *acted* by the Holy Ghost, both as to things and words, that rendered them infallible revealers of him unto the church. And thus the foundation of the canonical authority of the books of the Scripture is absolutely the same in and unto them all, without the least variety, either from any difference in *kind* or *degree.*

9. The same is their condition as to their being *canonical; they are all equally so.* Some of the ancients used that term *ambiguously;* and therefore sometimes call books canonical that absolutely are not so, as not being written by *divine inspiration,* nor given by the Holy Ghost to be any part of the rule of the church's faith and obedience. Thus the Constantinopolitan council in Trulla[1] confirms

[1] Concil. Constan. in Trul. can. ii.

the canons both of the synod of Laodicea and the third of Carthage, which agree not in the catalogues they give us of books canonical; which, without a supposition of the ambiguity of the word, could not be done, unless they would give an assent unto a plain and open contradiction. And the council of Carthage makes evident its sense in their appendix annexed to the one and fortieth canon, wherein they reckon up the books of the holy Scripture. "Hoc etiam," say they, "fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifacio, vel aliis earum partium episcopis, pro confirmando isto canone, innotescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus legenda; liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies celebrantur."[1] They speak dubiously concerning their own determination, and intimate that they called the books they enumerated canonical only as they might be read in the church; which privilege they grant also to the stories of the sufferings of the martyrs, which yet none thought to be properly canonical. The same Epiphanius[2] testifies of the epistles of Clemens. But as the books which that synod added to the canon of Laodicea are rejected by Melito,[3] Origen, Athanasius,[4] Hilarius,[5] Gregorius Nazianzen,[6] Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus,[7] Epiphanius,[8] Rufinus,[9] Jerome,[10] Gregorius Magnus, and others; so their reading and citation is generally declared by them to have been only for direction of manners, and not for the confirmation of the faith: even as St Paul cited an iambic out of Menander, or rather Euripides, 1 Cor. xv. 33; an hemistichium out of Aratus, Acts xvii. 28; and a whole hexameter out of Epimenides, Titus i. 12. "Non sunt canonici, sed leguntur catechumenis," saith Athanasius;—"They are not canonical, but are only read to the catechumeni." And Jerome saith, the church reads them "ad edificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam,"—"for the edification of the people, but not for the confirmation of any points of faith."[11] But although some books truly canonical were of old amongst some ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῳ, as Epiphanius[12] speaks,—*doubted of;* and some were commonly read that are certainly ἀπόκρυφα and *rejectitious;* yet neither the mistake of the former nor latter practice can give any countenance to an apprehension of a *second* or various sort of books properly canonical. For the interest of any book or writing in the canon of the Scripture accruing unto it, as hath been showed, merely from its *divine inspiration,* and being given by the Holy Ghost for a *rule,* measure, and standard of faith and obedience unto the church, whatever advantage or worth to commend it any writing may have, yet if it have not the proper-

[1] Concil. Carth. 3, cap. xlvii. cod. can. xx. [2] Epiphan. Hær. xxx. cap. xv. [3] Euseb. lib. iv. cap. xxvi.; lib. vi. cap. xxv. [4] Athanas. in Synops. [5] Hilar. Præfat. in Ps. [6] Nazian. in Carmin. [7] Cyril. Catech. iv. [8] Epiphan. Hær. viii. [9] Ruf. Exposit. Symb. [10] Hieron. Præf. Galeat. ad Paulin. [11] Hieron. Præf. in lib. Solom. [12] Epiphan. Hær. viii.

ties mentioned of divine inspiration and confirmation, it differs in the *whole kind*, and not in *degrees* only, from all those that have them; so that it can be no part *regulæ regulantis*, but *regulatæ* at the best, not having αὐτοπιστίαν, or a "self-credibility" on its own account, or αὐθεντείαν, a "self-sufficing authority," but is truth only *materially*, by virtue of its analogy unto that which is absolutely, universally, and perfectly so. And this was well observed by Lindanus. "Impio," saith he, "sacrilegio se contaminant qui in Scripturarum Christianarum corpore, quosdam quasi gradus conantur locare; quod unam eandemque Spiritus Sancti vocem, impio humanæ stultitiæ discerniculo audent in varias impares discerpere, et disturbare auctoritatis classes;" —"They defile themselves with the impiety of sacrilege who endeavour to bring in, as it were, divers degrees into the body of the Scriptures; for by the impious discretion of human folly, they would cast the one voice of the Holy Ghost into various forms of unequal authority."[1] As, then, whatever *difference* there may be as to the subject-matter, manner of writing, and present usefulness, between any of the books that, being written by divine inspiration, are given out for the church's rule, they are all *equal* as to their canonical authority, being equally interested in that which is the *formal reason* of it; so, whatever usefulness or respect in the church any other writings may have, it can no way give them any interest in that whose formal reason they are not concerned in.

10. In the sense explained, we affirm the Epistle to the Hebrews to be *canonical*, that is, properly and strictly so, and of the number of them which the ancients called γνήσια, ἐνδιάθηκα, καθολικά, ἀναμφίλεκτα, and ὁμολογούμενα, every way *genuine* and *catholic:* in the confirmation whereof, we shall first declare by *whom* it hath been opposed or questioned, and then what *reasons* they pretend for their so doing; which being removed out of our way, the arguments whereby the truth of our assertion is evinced shall be insisted on.

11. We need not much insist on their madness who of old, with a sacrilegious licentiousness, rejected what portion of Scripture they pleased. The Ebionites not only rejected all the epistles of Paul, but also reviled his person as a Greek and an apostate, as Irenæus[2] and Epiphanius[3] inform us. Their folly and blasphemy was also imitated and followed by the Helcesaitæ in Eusebius.[4] Marcion rejected in particular this Epistle to the Hebrews, and those also to Timothy and Titus, as Epiphanius[5] and Jerome[6] assure us, who adds unto him Basilides. And Theodoret,[7] as to the Epistle unto the Hebrews, joins unto them some of the Arians also. Now, though the folly of those sacrilegious persons be easy to be repelled, as it is

[1] Lindan. Panopl. Evang. lib. iii. cap. iv. [2] Iren. lib. i. cap. ii. [3] Epiphan. Hær. xxx. cap. xxv. [4] Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xxxviii. [5] Epiphan. Hær. xlii. cap. ix. [6] Hieron. Præf. in Com. ad Titum. [7] Theodor. Præf. in Ep. ad Heb.

done by Petrus Cluniensis,[1] yet Jerome hath given us a sufficient reason why we should not spend time therein. "Si quidem," saith he, "redderent causas cur eas apostoli non putant, tentaremus aliquid respondere, et forsitan satisfacere lectori; nunc vero cum hæretica auctoritate pronunciant et dicunt, illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est, ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescant falsa simulare." They did not so much as plead or pretend any *cause* or *reason* for the rejection of these epistles, but did it upon their own head and authority; so they deserve neither answer nor consideration.

12. It is of more importance that this Epistle was a long time, though not *rejected* by, yet not *received* in the church of Rome. Eusebius[2] informs us that Caius, a presbyter of that church, whom he much commends for his learning and piety, admitted but of thirteen epistles of St Paul, rejecting that unto the Hebrews; as Photius[3] also affirms. And the same Photius acquaints us with the same judgment of Hippolytus, another eminent member of that church: Λέγει, saith he, δὲ ἄλλα τά τινα τῆς ἀκριβείας λειπόμενα, καὶ ὅτι ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους Ἐπιστολὴ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου·—"Among other things not exactly answering the truth, he saith also that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not Paul's." And Eusebius adds unto his information of the judgment of Caius, that it was not generally received in the church of Rome in his time. Neither is it any way acknowledged as St Paul's by either Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, or Arnobius. Yea, the same Eusebius[4] affirms that some excepted against it upon this account, because it was opposed as none of St Paul's in the Roman church. Jerome grants that "Latinorum consuetudo non recepit Epistolam ad Hebræos inter canonicas Scripturas,—" the custom of the Latins" (that is, the Roman church) "did not receive this Epistle among the canonical Scriptures." And speaking elsewhere of it, he adds the same words, "Licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas Scripturas non recipiat."[5] And elsewhere also he confirms the same assertion. It cannot, then, be denied but that it was four hundred years at least after the writing of this Epistle before it was publicly received and avowed as canonical by the Roman church. Nor will the quotation of it by Hilary and Ambrose prove any general admission of it as such, it being their custom not to restrain the testimonies they made use of unto books absolutely canonical.

13. Baronius,[6] ad an. 60, labours to take off this failure of the Latin church. The testimony of Eusebius he rejects, because, as he

[1] Petrus Cluniensis. Epist. ad Petrobrusia. [2] Euseb. lib. iii. cap. iii., lib. vi. cap. xx. [3] Photius Biblioth. cod. xlviii. cod. cxx. [4] Lib. iii. cap. iii. [5] Epist. cxxix. ad Dardan.; Comment. in Esa. viii.; in cap. i. ad Eccles. de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.; in Caio; in Matt. xxvi.; in Zach. viii.; lib. iv. de Trin.; lib. ii. de Cain. [6] Ann. Eccles. an. 60, n. 56.

says, he was "Arianorum gregalis," "of the Arian faction," and willing to call the authority of this Epistle into question, in compliance with them who, some of them, as we observed before, refused it, n. 56; the judgment of Caius he resolves into the testimony of Eusebius, which, because of his partiality, as he pleads, is not to be admitted; and lastly, he opposeth the witness of Jerome, as a person who had suffered himself to be imposed on by Eusebius, whose words, in his reports of Caius, he makes use of, n. 56; concluding upon the whole matter, that it was a mere false calumny of Eusebius against the church of Rome, which Jerome, by too much facility, gave credit unto. But I must acknowledge that these answers of his,—which indeed are nothing but a rejection of as good witnesses in matters of fact as any we have upon the roll of antiquity,—are not unto me satisfactory; no more than the testimony of its acceptance which he produceth in the Epistle of Innocentius to Exsuperius, which is justly suspected supposititious, with the council at Rome against Apollinaris, under Damasus, wherein no such thing appears,—though I will not deny but that about that time it came to be publicly owned by that church, and was reckoned unto the canon of the Scripture by Rufinus.[1]

14. But wherein doth it in the least appear that Eusebius reports the judgment of Caius or of the Roman church in compliance with the Arians? He himself evidently admits the Epistle to be canonical, and confirms it by the testimonies of Clemens, Origen, and others. What would it advantage him, or the cause which some pretend he favoured, by reporting the opposition of others to a part of divine writ which himself accepted? Besides, they were not the Arians of the first rank or edition (for an inclination unto whom Eusebius is suspected), but some of their offspring, which fell out into such sacrilegious opinions and practices as the first leaders of them owned not, that are accused in this matter. Much less can he be thought to design the reproach of the Roman church. Nay, these answers are inconsistent, as any one may perceive. He could not at the same time design the rejecting of the Epistle in compliance with the Arians and the calumniating of them by whom it was rejected, and on whose authority his intention must be founded. But indeed his words plainly manifest that he gives us a naked account of matter of fact, without either prejudice or design. It is yet more incredible that Jerome in this matter should suffer himself to be imposed on by Eusebius. That he was the most eminently learned and knowing person of the Roman or Latin church in those days will, I suppose, not be greatly questioned. Now, to suppose that he knew not the customs, opinions, and practice, of that church, but would suffer himself to be imposed on by a *stranger*, destitute of those advan-

[1] Exposit. Symb. Apostol.

tages which he had to come unto an unquestionable certainty in it, is a very fond thing. Besides, he doth not anywhere speak as one that reported the words and judgment of another, but in three or four places expressly affirms it as of his own knowledge; while, at the same time, in opposition thereunto, he contends that it was received by all other churches in the world, and all writers from the days of the apostles.

15. Neither yet doth it appear, from any thing delivered by Caius, Hippolytus, Eusebius, or Jerome, that the Latin church did ever *reject* this Epistle; yea, we shall find that many amongst them, even in those days, reckoned it unto the canon of the Scripture, and owned St Paul as the penman of it. Eusebius[1] himself acknowledges that Clemens useth sundry testimonies out of it in his epistle "ad Corinthios;" and others also there were concurring with his judgment therein. But these two things I allow, on the testimonies insisted on:—(1.) That sundry particular persons of note and esteem in the Roman church owned not the canonical authority of this Epistle, as not esteeming it written by St Paul. (2.) The church itself had not before the days of Jerome made any *public judgment* about the author or authority of this Epistle, nor given any testimony unto them; for it seems utterly impossible that, if any such judgment had passed or testimony been given, Jerome, living in the midst of that church, should know nothing of it, but so often affirm the contrary without hesitation. And this undeniably evinceth the injustice of some men's pretensions, that the Roman church is the only proposer of canonical Scripture, and that upon the *authority* of her proposal alone it is to be received. Four hundred years were past before she herself publicly received this Epistle, or read it in her assemblies; so far was she from having proposed it unto others. And yet all this while it was admitted and received by all other churches in the world, as Jerome testifies, and that from the days of the apostles; whose judgment the Roman church itself at length submitted unto.

16. No impeachment, then, of the authority of this Epistle can be taken from this defect and inadvertency of the Roman church, it being evinced to be so by the concurrent suffrage and testimony of all other churches in the world from the days of the apostles; as we shall afterwards more fully declare. Neither are the occasions of this hesitation of the western church obscure. The Epistle was written, it may be, in Rome; at least it was written in some part of Italy, chap. xiii. 24. There, no doubt, it was *seen*, and, it may be, *copied out* before its sending, by some who used to accompany the apostle, as Clemens; who, as we have showed, not long after mentioned divers things contained in it. The original was, without question, speedily

[1] Eccles. Hist. lib. iii. cap. xxxviii.

sent into Judea unto the Hebrews, to whom it was written and directed; as were all others of the epistles of the same apostle unto those churches that were immediately intended and concerned in them. That copies of it were by them also communicated unto their brethren in the east, equally concerned in it with themselves, cannot be doubted; unless we will suppose them grossly negligent in their duty towards God and man, which we have no reason to do. But the churches of the Hebrews living at that time, and for some while after, if not in a *separation*, yet in a *distinction*, by reason of some peculiar observances, from the churches of the Gentiles, especially those of the west, they were not, it may be, very forward in communicating this Epistle unto them; being written, as they supposed, about an especial concernment of their own. By this means this Epistle seems to have been kept much within the compass of the churches of the Jews until after the destruction of the temple, when, by their dispersion and coalescency with other churches in the east, it came to be generally received amongst them; and "non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiis et Græci sermonis scriptoribus," as Jerome speaks.[1] But the Latin church, having lost that advantage of receiving it upon its first writing,—it may be, also, upon the consideration of the removal of its peculiar argument upon the final destruction of the whole Judaical church and worship,—was somewhat slow in their inquiry after it. Those that succeeded in that church, it is not unlikely, had their scruples increased, because they found it not in common use amongst their predecessors, like to the rest of St Paul's Epistles, not considering the occasion thereof. Add hereunto that by that time it had gradually made its progress in its return into the west, where it was first written, and, attended with the suffrage of all the eastern churches, begun to evince its own authority, sundry persons, who were wrangling about peculiar opinions and practices of their own, began to seek advantages from some expressions in it. So, in particular, did the Novatians and the Donatists. This might possibly increase the scruple amongst the orthodox, and make them wary in their admission of that authority which they found pleaded against them. And well was it for them that the opinions about which they disagreed with their adversaries were according unto truth, seeing it may justly be feared that some then would have made them their rule and standard in their reception or rejection of this Epistle; for it was no new thing for the orthodox themselves to make bold sometimes with the Scripture, if they supposed it to run cross unto their conceptions. So Epiphanius informs us in Ancorat.: Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔκλαυσε, κᾶτα ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις, καὶ κέχρηται τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ ὁ ἅγιος Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ αἱρέσεων, πρὸς τοὺς

[1] Epist ad Dardan.

δοκήσει τὸν Χριστὸν πεφηνέναι λέγοντας· ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ ἀφείλοντο τὸ ῥητὸν, φοβηθέντες, καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες αὐτου τὸ τέλος, καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρότατον·—"And also 'He wept;' for so it is read in the uncorrected copies of the Gospel according to Luke. And St Irenæus useth this testimony in his book against heresies, for their confutation who affirmed that Christ took flesh only in appearance; but the orthodox" (or Catholics) "being afraid" (of the importance of that expression), "took away that word out of the copies, not understanding its use and sense." So also Sixtus Senensis, after he hath informed us, out of Hilary, that many orthodox persons denied the story of our Saviour's agony and bloody sweat, adds of his own, "Suspicor a Catholicis sublatam esse, pio sed simplici zelo, quod favere videbatur Arianis;" —"I suspect that the story was taken out of the copies by some Catholics, out of a godly but simple zeal, because it seemed to favour the Arians." So great is the power of prejudice, and so little occasions have men taken, whom others have esteemed orthodox and pious, to make bold with that word whereby both we and all our opinions must be judged! But it being manifest at length that no colour was given unto the unjust severities of the Novatians by any thing in this Epistle, it was generally embraced; and by the conquest of this opposition established its authority for the future.

17. Bellarmine[1] chargeth Luther, Brentius, Chemnitius, and the Centuriators, with the rejection of this Epistle. But because I know that some of them are falsely accused by him, I am apt to suspect the same of the rest, which I have not the opportunity to consult; and so I shall not reckon them amongst the opposers of this Epistle. The matter is more certain concerning Cajetan and Erasmus; the former in his preface unto, the other in his last annotation on, this Epistle, denying it to be St Paul's, and questioning, yea, indeed rejecting, its canonical authority. To them we may add Enjedinus, proceeding upon the same principles, and making use of their arguments to the same purpose. These are the chief, if not absolutely all, who have at any time made any scruple at the authority of this Epistle. The reasons they make use of to justify themselves in their conjectures are amassed together by Erasmus in his note on the 24th verse of the last chapter of it. But because he mixeth together the arguments that he insists on to prove St Paul not to have been the penman of it and the exceptions he puts in unto its canonical authority, which are things of a diverse consideration, I shall separate them, and first take out those that seem absolutely to impeach its authority, leaving them that oppose its penman to our ensuing discourse on that question in particular.

18. The first thing generally pleaded is, *the uncertainty of its author* or penman. "Sola omnium Pauli nomen non præfert," saith

[1] De Verb. Dei, lib. i. cap. xi.

Erasmus. How unjust and groundless this pretence is we shall afterwards fully manifest. At present I shall only show that it is, in general, of no importance in this cause. The author of a writing being certainly known, may indeed give some light into the nature and authority of it. When it is confessed that the penman of any book was θεόπνευστος, or "divinely inspired," and that by him it was written for the use of the church, there can be no question of its authority. But this last, of his design directed by the Holy Ghost, must be no less known than the former; for a man may write one book by inspiration, and others by a fallible, human judgment, as Solomon seems to have done his philosophical discourses that are lost. Again; when the penman of any writing pretending unto divine authority is not esteemed, nor doth manifest himself in any thing to have been, ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενος, "immediately acted by the Holy Ghost," the writing itself must needs be liable unto just exception. Wherefore it is confessed, that when the author of any writing is *certainly known*, much light into its authority and relation unto the canon of the Scripture may be thence received; but when this is *doubtful*, nothing satisfactory can thence on either side be concluded. And therefore it hath pleased the Holy Ghost to keep the names of the penmen of many parts of the Scripture in everlasting obscurity; for he borrows no countenance or authority, unto any thing that proceeds by inspiration from himself, from the names of men. There is not, then, the least strength in this exception; for be it granted that we are altogether uncertain who was the penman of this Epistle, yet no impeachment of its authority can thence be taken, unless it can be proved that he was not *divinely inspired.* But yet, to show the insufficiency, every way, of this objection, we shall abundantly evince that indeed the very ground and foundation of it is feeble and false, the penman of this Epistle being as well and certainly known as those of any portions of Scripture whatever that are ἀνεπίγραφα, some whereof were never doubted nor called into question. And at least we shall so far evince St Paul to have been the author of it, as, although we shall not from thence take any argument to prove its canonical authority, because it hath itself been called into question, yet to render an objection from the uncertainty of its author altogether unreasonable.

19. The remaining objections are more particular and direct to their purpose by whom they are pleaded; as, first, that the author of this Epistle *cites sundry things out of the Old Testament which are not therein contained.* Such are many of the stories related in the 11th chapter; and that, in particular, in chap. xii. 21, where he affirms that Moses, upon the terror of the sight that appeared unto him, said, "I exceedingly fear and quake." This place Erasmus supposeth Jerome to have intended when he says

that some things are mentioned in this Epistle that are not recorded in the Old Testament. And Aquinas perplexeth himself in seeking for a solution unto this difficulty; for, first, he would refer the place to Moses' sight of the Angel in the bush, and not to the giving of the law, contrary to the express discourse of the context. And then he adds, "Dixit saltem facto;" though he *said* not so, yet he *did* so. And lastly, worst of all, "Vel forte apostolus aliâ utitur literâ quam nos non habemus;"—"Or, it may be, the apostle used another text, that we have not." But there is no need of any of these evasions. The author quotes no book nor testimony of the Old Testament, but only relates a matter of fact, and one circumstance of it, which doubtless he had by divine revelation, whereof there is no express mention in the place where the whole matter is originally recorded. Thus in the beginning of the Chronicles, sundry particular stories (as that about the children of Ephraim, chap. vii. 20–22), nowhere before written, are reported from the same infallible directions that others of the same time were written withal when they were omitted. And it is an uncouth way of proving an author not to write by divine inspiration, because he writeth truths that he could no otherwise be acquainted withal. Neither is it unmeet for him that writes by divine inspiration to mention things recorded in other stories whose truth is unquestionable; as those are related in chap. xi.

20. It seems to be of more importance that, if the objectors may be believed, the writer of this Epistle *citeth testimonies out of the Old Testament that are no ways to his purpose*, nor at all prove the matter that he produceth them for, discovering at least that he wrote with a *fallible spirit*, if not also that he dealt scarcely *bonâ fide* in handling the cause which he undertook. Cajetan insists on that of the first chapter, verse 5, "I will be unto him a Father, and he shall be unto me a Son," taken from 2 Sam. vii. 14, or 1 Chron. xvii. 13; which words, as he supposeth, no way belong unto that in whose confirmation they are produced by the author of this Epistle. Erasmus insists upon his testimony in chap. ii. 6, produced out of Ps. viii. 4, 5; which, as he saith, is urged to the direct contrary of the intention of the psalmist and scope of the words. Enjedinus insists on the same places and others.

Now, two things must be supposed, to give countenance unto this objection:—First, That *those who make it do better understand the meaning and importance of the testimonies so produced* out of the Old Testament *than he did by whom they are here alleged.* This is the foundation of this exception; which if once admitted, it may be easily imagined how *able* some men will quickly think themselves to question other allegations in the New Testament, and thereby render the authority of the whole dubious. They must, I

say, take upon themselves to know the *true meaning* of them, and that in the uttermost extent of signification and intention, as given out by the Holy Ghost, before they can charge their *misapplication* on this author. How vain, unjust, arrogant, and presumptuous, this supposition is, needs little labour to demonstrate. The understandings of men are a very sorry measure of the truth, with the whole sense and intendment of the Holy Ghost in every place of Scripture. Nay, it may much more rationally be supposed, that though we all know *enough* of the mind and will of God in the whole Scripture to guide and regulate our faith and obedience, yet that we are rather ignorant of his *utmost* intention in *any* place than that we know it in *all.* There is a *depth* and *breadth in every word of God,* because his, which we are not able to fathom and compass to the utmost; it being enough for us that we may infallibly apprehend so much of his mind and will as is *indispensably* necessary for us to the obedience that he requires at our hands. An humble, reverential consideration of all, indeed almost any, of the testimonies alleged in the New Testament out of the Old, is sufficient to evince the truth of this consideration. "We know but in part, and we prophesy in part," 1 Cor. xiii. 9. "Quantum est quod nescimus!"—"How much is it that we know not!" Or, as Job speaks, מַה־שֶּׁמֶץ דָּבָר,—"How small is the word that we understand of God!" chap. xxvi. 14. One says well, "Est sacra Scriptura veluti fons quidam, in bono terræ loco scaturiens, quem quo altius foderis, eo magis exuberantem invenies; ita quo diligentius sacram Scripturam interpretaris, eo abundantiores aquæ vivæ venas reperies," Brent. Hom. xxxvi. in 1 Sam. xi. That objection, then, must needs be very weak whose fundamental strength consists in so vain a presumption. Again, They must take it for granted that they are *aforehand fully acquainted with the particular intention of the author* in the assertions which he produceth these testimonies in the confirmation of; and with all the ways of arguing and pressing principles of faith, used by men writing by divine inspiration.

Neither is this supposition less rash or presumptuous than the former. Men who bring their own hypotheses and preconceived senses unto the Scripture, with a desire to have them confirmed, are apt to make such conclusions. Those that come with humility and reverence of His majesty with whom they have to do, to learn from him his mind and will therein, whatever he shall thereby reveal so to be, will have other thoughts and apprehensions. Let men but suffer the testimonies and assertions, whose unsuitableness is pretended, to explain one another, and the agreement will quickly appear; and the worst that will ensue will be only the emergence of a sense from them which perhaps they understood not in either of them singly or separately considered. Thus infirm on all accounts is this objection.

For the *instances* themselves, some light will be given unto them from what we shall afterwards discourse of the author's ways and *principles*, that he proceeds upon in his citations of testimonies out of the Old Testament; and, in particular, in our exposition of the places themselves, we shall manifest that his application of them is every way suitable to the very letter of the text and the manifest intention of the Holy Ghost. So false and unjust, as well as rash and presumptuous, is this objection.

21. Neither is there any more real weight in that which Erasmus in the next place objects,—namely, that *some things in it seem to give countenance unto some exploded opinions of ancient heretics;* whereof he gives us a double instance. First, "Quod velum separans sanctum sanctorum interpretatur cœlum;"—"That he interprets the veil separating the most holy place to be heaven:" which indeed he neither doth (but only affirms that the most holy place in the tabernacle was a type or figure of heaven itself), nor, if he should have so done, had he given the least countenance unto the fondness of the Manichees, whom I suppose he intendeth; his whole discourse perfectly exploding their abominations. His other instance is in that vexed place, chap. vi. 4–8, favouring, as he pretends, the Novatians, denying recovery by repentance unto them who had fallen into sin after baptism. But the incompetency of this objection, arising merely from their ignorance of the true meaning of the Holy Ghost that made it, as to the end for which it was used, hath been demonstrated by many of old and late. And, the Lord assisting, in our exposition of that place we shall show that it is so far from giving countenance unto any error or mistake which any man may fall into contrary to the gospel, that a more plain, familiar, and wholesome commination is hardly to be found in the whole book of God.

And this is the sum of what I can meet withal that is objected against the canonical authority of this Epistle; which how little it amounts unto, beyond an evidence of men's willingness to lay hold on slight occasions to vent their curiosities and conceptions, the reader that is godly and wise will quickly perceive.

22. Having removed these objections out of our way, we shall now proceed to *demonstrate* the *canonical authority of this Epistle*, in the strict and proper sense at large before declared. Now, the sum of what we shall plead in this cause amounts to this, that, whereas there are many τεκμήρια, or *infallible evidences*, of any writings being given by divine inspiration, and sundry arguments whereby books or writings ungroundedly pretending to that original may be disproved, of the former, there is *not one* that is not applicable unto this Epistle, nor is it obnoxious unto *any one* of the latter sort. Of what nature in general that evidence is which is given unto the divine original of the Scripture by the characters thereof implanted in it,

or other testimony given unto it, or what is the assurance of mind concerning it which thereupon we are furnished withal, belongs not unto our present inquiry. That which we undertake is only to manifest that the interest in them of this Epistle, and its immunity from *rational* exceptions, is equal unto, and no less conspicuous than, that of any other portion of holy writ whatever; so that it stands upon the same basis with the whole, which at present we suppose firm and unmovable.

Eusebius,[1] who, after Melito, Caius, Clemens, and Origen, made a very accurate inquiry after the books unquestionably canonical, gives us three notes of distinction between them that are so and others,—namely, (1.) Φράσεως χαρακτήρ, the *character* or manner of phrase or speech; (2.) Γνώμη, the *sentence* or subject-matter treated of; and, (3.) Προαίρεσις, the *purpose* and design of the writer: and they are all of great importance, and to be considered by us in this matter. But because others of like moment may be added unto them, and are used by others of the ancients to the same end, we shall insist upon them all in that order which seems most natural unto them, yet so as that they may be all referred unto those general heads by him proposed.

23. Two things there are that belong to the γνώμη, or *sentence* of this Epistle,—first, its *general argument;* and, secondly, the *particular subject-matter* treated of in it. These seem to be designed thereby. Now, the general argument of this Epistle is the same with that of the whole Scripture besides; that is, a revelation of the will of God as to the faith and obedience of the church; and this holy, heavenly, and divine,—answering the wisdom, truth, and sovereignty, of him from whom it doth proceed. Hence they are called Λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, "The oracles of God," Rom. iii. 2, or the infallible revelation of his will; and Ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου, John vi. 68, "The words of eternal life;" for that, in the name of God, they treat about. And St Paul tells us that the argument of the gospel is "wisdom," but "not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of it," who are destroyed, done away, and made useless by it,—that is, the chief leaders of human wisdom and science,—1 Cor. ii. 6: but it is σοφία Θεοῦ ἐν μυστηρίῳ, ἡ ἀποκεκρυμμένη, etc.,—"the mysterious wisdom of God, that was hidden from them," ver. 7; things of his own mere revelation from his sovereign will and pleasure, with a stamp and impress of his goodness and wisdom upon them, quite of another nature than any thing that the choicest wisdom of the princes of this world can reach or attain unto. And such is the argument of this Epistle: it treats of things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have they," by any natural means, ever "entered into the heart of man," and that in absolute harmony with all other unquestionable revelations of the will of God. Now, if the immediate original hereof be not

[1] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxv

from God,—that is, by the *inspiration* of the Holy Ghost,—then it must be either the *invention* of some man, spinning the whole web and frame of it out of his own imagination, or from his *diligence* in framing and composing of it from a *system* of principles collected out of other writings of divine revelation. The first will not be pretended.

Two things absolutely free it from suffering under any such suspicion: First, the nature of its argument, treating, as was said, of such things as "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have they entered into the heart of man." The deity, offices, sacrifice, mediation, and grace, of Jesus Christ, are not things that can have any foundation in the invention and imagination of man; yea, being revealed by God, they lie in a direct contradiction unto all that naturally is esteemed wise or perfect, 1 Cor. i. 18–23. They exceed the sphere of natural comprehension, and are destructive of the principles which it frameth unto itself for the compassing of those ends whereunto they are designed.

Nor is it liable to be esteemed of the other extract, or the *diligence and wisdom* of man in collecting it from other books of divine revelation; which alone with any colour of reason can be pretended. *Human* diligence, regulated by what is elsewhere revealed of God, is *human* still; and can never free itself from those inseparable attendancies which will manifest itself so to be; for suppose a man may compose a writing wherein every *proposition* in itself shall be true, and the whole in its contexture *materially* every way answerable unto the truth (which yet must be *accidental* as to the principle of his wisdom, understanding, ability, and diligence, by whom it is composed, they being no way able to give that effect certainly and infallibly unto it), yet there will never be wanting that in it whereby it may be discerned from an immediate effect and product of divine wisdom and understanding. Take but the writings of any wise man, who, from his own ability and invention, hath declared any science in them, and allow his discovery of it to be the absolute, complete rule of that science, so that nothing *beyond* or *beside* what he hath written about it is true or certain, nor any thing else, but as it hath conformity to or coincidence with what he hath written, and it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for any man so to treat of that subject from his writings as not to leave sufficient *characters* upon his own to difference them from his *original* and pattern; for suppose him to have in all things attained the perfect sense of his guide,—which yet, it may be, until all words are freed from their ambiguity, will be impossible for any one to do, —yet still there will remain upon it such an *impression* of the genius and fancy wherein the rule was first framed as the follower can not express. And how much more will there be so in that which both for *matter* and *words* also, proceeds from the sovereign will

and wisdom of God! Can it be supposed, that any man should collect, by his own industry and diligence, a writing out of that which is given by Him, and regulated thereby, that should absolutely express those infinite perfections of his nature which *shine* forth in that which is immediately from himself? For that any writing should be pretended to be undiscernible from them given by divine inspiration, it is not enough that the matter of it be *universally true*, and that truth no other but what is contained in other parts of Scripture, but it must also have those other τεκμήρια or *characters* of a divine original which we shall in our progress discover in this Epistle, as in other books of the holy Scripture; for it is not behind the very choicest of them.

And the truth of this consideration is demonstrated in the instances of *every one* of those writings which may probably be concluded to have the nearest affinity and similitude unto those of divine inspiration, from the greatness and urgency of their plea to be admitted into that series and order. These are the books commonly called Apocrypha. Not one of them is there wherein *human* diligence doth not discover itself to be its fountain and spring. Did this Epistle proceed from the same root and principle, whence comes it to pass that it nowhere puts itself forth unto a discovery and conviction? For that it doth not so we shall afterwards fully declare. Besides, to close this consideration, the design of the writer of this Epistle manifests that he sought the glory of God in Christ, according unto his will. With this aim and purpose, an endeavour to impose that on the church, as an *immediate revelation from God*, which was the *product* of his own pains and diligence, is utterly inconsistent. For by no means could he more dishonour God, whose glory in sincerity he appears to have sought; nor wrong the church, whose good he desired to promote; than by this imposing on him that whereof he was not the author, so *adding unto his words*, and making himself subject to reproof as a liar, Prov. xxx. 6, and proposing that unto the church as a firm and stable *rule* and object of faith which he knew not to be so, leading her thereby into error, uncertainty, and falsehood. For this whole Epistle is delivered as the will and word of God, as coming by *revelation* from him, without the least intimation of the intervention of the will, wisdom, or diligence, of man, any other than is constantly ascribed unto those that declare the will of God by *inspiration*. And if it were not so, the evils mentioned cannot be avoided. And how groundless this imputation would be, our following discourses will manifest. And I doubt not but this whole consideration will be, and is, of weight and moment with them who have *their senses exercised in the Scriptures*, and are enabled, by the Spirit breathing in them, to discern between good and evil, wheat and chaff, Jer. xxiii. 28.

24. Unto the *general argument*, we may add the *particular subject-matter* of this Epistle, as belonging unto the γνώμη of it, further confirming its *divine original*. This, for the most part, consists in things of *pure revelation*, and which have no other foundation "in rerum natura." Some books, even of the Scripture itself, are but the narrations of *actions done amongst men;* which, for the substance of them, might be also recorded by human diligence: but the things treated of in this Epistle are purely divine, spiritual, and no ways to be known but by revelation. And not only so, but amongst those that are so, there are four things eminent in the *subject-matter* of this Epistle: (1.) That the principal things treated of in it are matters of the *greatest importance* in Christian religion, and such as concern the very foundation of faith. Such are the doctrines about the person, offices, and sacrifice of Christ; of the nature of gospel worship, our privilege therein, and communion with God thereby. In these things consist the very vitals of our profession; and they are all opened and declared in a most excellent and heavenly manner in this Epistle; and that, as we shall manifest, in an absolute *consonancy* unto what is taught concerning them in other places of Scripture. (2.) In that some things of *great moment* unto the faith, obedience, and consolation of the church, that are but *obscurely* or sparingly taught in any other places of holy writ, are here plainly, fully, and excellently taught and improved. Such, in particular, is the doctrine of the *priesthood* of Christ, with the nature and excellency of his *sacrifice*, and the execution of the remaining parts and duty of that office in heaven, and how the whole of it was *typically* represented under the old testament. He that understands aright the importance of these things,—their *use* in the faith and consolation of the church, their influence into our whole course of obedience, the spiritual privilege that faith by them interests a believing soul in, the strength and supportment that they afford under temptations and trials,—will be ready to conclude that the world may as well want the sun in the firmament as the church this Epistle; and this persuasion we hope, through God's assistance, to further in our exposition of it. (3.) God's way in teaching the church of the old testament, with the use and end of all the operose pedagogy of Moses, manifesting it to be full of wisdom, grace, and love, is here fully revealed, and the whole Aaronical priesthood, with all the duties and offices of it, translated unto the use of believers under the gospel. How dark Mosaical institutions were in themselves is evident from the whole state of the church in the days of Christ and his apostles, when they could not see unto the end of the things that were to be done away. In their nature they were *carnal;* in their number, *many;* as to their reason, *hidden;* in their observation, *heavy* and burdensome; in their outward show,

pompous and glorious: by all which they so possessed the minds of the church, that very few saw clearly into the use, intention, and end of them. But in this Epistle the "veil" is taken off from Moses, the mystery of his institutions laid open,—a perfect *clue* given unto believers to pass safely through all the turnings and windings of them unto rest and truth in Jesus Christ. Those *hidden things* of the old testament appear now unto us full of light and instruction; but we are beholden for all our insight into them, and benefit which we receive thereby, unto the exposition and application of them made by the Holy Ghost in this Epistle. And how great a portion of gospel wisdom and knowledge consists herein all men know who have any spiritual acquaintance with these things. (4.) The grounds, reasons, causes, and manner, of that great alteration which God wrought and caused in his worship, by taking down the ancient glorious fabric of it, which had been set up by his own appointment, are here laid open and manifested, and the greatest controversy that ever the church of God was exercised withal is here fully determined.

There was nothing, in the first propagation of the gospel and plantation of Christian churches, that did so divide and perplex the professors of the truth, and retard the work of promulgating the knowledge of Christ, and the worship of God in him, as the difference that was about the continuation and observation of Mosaical rites and ceremonies. To such a height was this difference raised, so zealously were the parties at variance engaged in the pursuit of their various apprehensions of the mind of God in this matter, that the apostles themselves thought meet for a season rather to *umpire* and compose the controversy, by leaving the Jews free to their observation, and bringing the Gentiles unto a condescension in things of the greatest exasperation, than absolutely and precisely to determine the whole matter between them. And, indeed, this being a *difference* wherein the will, authority, and command of God were pleaded on the *mistaken* side, they being all of them clear and full as to the matter by them pleaded for, nothing but an immediate declaration of the mind of God himself, as to his removing and taking off the obligation of his own law, could put such an end unto it as that the spirits of men might acquiesce therein. Now, the will of God to this purpose before the writing of this Epistle could only be *collected* from the nature and state of things in the church upon the coming of the Messiah, and conclusions from thence, which the believing Jews were very slow in the admittance of. Add hereunto that many prophecies and promises of the Old Testament, setting forth the glory and beauty of gospel worship under the names and condition of the worship then in use, as of priests, Levites, sacrifices, offerings, feast of tabernacles, and the like, lay

directly, in the letter, against that cessation of Mosaical rites which the Jews opposed.

Now, who was fit, who was able, to determine upon these *different* and various institutions of God, but God himself? To declare *positively* that all obligation from his former commands was now ceased, that his institutions were no more to be observed, that the *time* allotted unto the church's obedience unto him in their observance was expired,—this was no otherwise to be effected but by an *immediate revelation* from himself. And this is done in this Epistle, and that in this *only* as to the Jews; whereby it became the main instrument and means of pulling up their old church-state, and translating it anew into the appointments of our Lord Jesus Christ. Neither is this done by a bare *declaration* of God's *authoritative interposition*, but, in a way of excellent and *singular wisdom* and condescension (with a manifestation of God's love and care unto his church, in the institutions that were now to be removed, and the progress of his wisdom in their gradual instruction, as they were able to bear), the whole nature, design, and intendment of them are evidenced to be *such*, as that, having received their full *end* and accomplishment, they did of themselves naturally expire and *disappear*. And hereby, in that great *alteration* which God then wrought in the outward worship of his church, there is discovered such a *oneness* and unchangeableness in his love and care; such a *suitableness*, harmony, and consonancy, in the effects of his will; such an evidence of infinite wisdom in disposing of them into a subserviency one to another, that they should nowhere in any thing cross or *interfere*, and all of them to his own glory, in the promotion and furtherance of the light, faith, and obedience of his church; as sufficiently manifest the original and fountain whence it doth proceed. For my part, I can truly say that I know not any portion of holy writ that will more effectually raise up the heart of an *understanding reader* to a holy admiration of the goodness, love, and wisdom of God, than this Epistle doth. Such, I say, is the *subject-matter* of this Epistle,—so divine, so excellent, so singular. And in the handling hereof have we not the least *occasional mixture* of any matter, words, sentences, stories, arguments, or doctrines, so unsuited to the whole as to argue the *interposure* of a fallible spirit. Thus we know it hath fallen out in all the writings of the Christians of the *first ages* after the sealing of the canon of the Scriptures. Many things in them appear to proceed from a holy and heavenly spirit breathing in their authors, and most of what they contain to be consonant unto the mind of God; yet have they *all of them* evident footsteps that the authors were subject unto *errors* and mistakes, even in and about the things written by them. And the continuance of their failings in their writings, capable of

an easy conviction, is no small fruit of the holy, wise providence of God, and his care over his church, that it might not in after ages be imposed upon with the great and weighty pretence of *antiquity*, to admit them into a competition with those which himself gave out to be its *infallible*, and therefore *only* rule. That nothing of this nature, nothing *humanitus*, merely after the manner of men, befell the writer of this Epistle in his work, we hope, through the assistance of its principal Author, to manifest in our exposition of the several parts of it. And the *subject-matter* of this Epistle, thus handled, further secures us of its *original*.

25. The *design*, *aim*, and *end* of the Epistle, with the purpose and intention of its writer, which belong to the προαίρεσις, which the *ancients* made a *characterism* of writings given by *divine inspiration*, are consonant unto the general argument and peculiar subject-matter of it. That the whole Scripture hath an *especial end*, which is peculiar unto it, and wherein *no other writing* hath any share, but only so far as it is taken from thence and composed in obedience thereunto, is evident unto all that do seriously consider it.

This *end*, supremely and absolutely, is the glory of that God who is the author of it. This is the *centre* where all the lines of it do meet, the *scope* and mark towards which all things in it are directed. It is the revelation of himself that is intended, of his mind and will, that he may be glorified; wherein, also, because he is the principal fountain and last end of all, consist the order and perfection of all other things. Particularly, the demonstration of this glory of God in and by Jesus Christ is aimed at. The works of God's *power and providence* do all of them declare his *glory*, the glory of his eternal perfections and excellencies, absolutely and in themselves. But the end of the Scripture is the glory of God in Christ, as he hath revealed himself and *gathered all things to a head in him*, unto the manifestation of his glory: for "this is life eternal, that we know him, the only true God; and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent." The *means* whereby God is thus glorified in Christ, is by the salvation of them that do *believe;* which is therefore also an *intermediate end* of the Scripture: "These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name," John xx. 31; 1 Tim. iv. 16. Moreover, whereas this *eternal life* unto the glory of God cannot be obtained without faith and obedience according to his will, the Scripture is given for this purpose, also, that it may instruct us in the mind of God, and "make us wise unto salvation," 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; Rom. i. 16; 2 Pet. i. 3. These, in their mutual subserviency and dependence, complete the *characteristical* end of the Scripture. I confess Plato, in his Timæus, makes it the end of *philosophy*, that we may thereby be "made like unto God." But that philosophy of his, having its

rise and spring in *inbred notions* of nature, and the contemplation of the works of God's providence, could have no other end but conformity unto him as his *perfections* were revealed *absolutely;* whereunto the Scripture adds this *revelation in Christ Jesus,* John i. 18, which gives them, as I said, their *special and peculiar end.* It makes God known as *all in all;* and man to be nothing, as to goodness or blessedness, but what he is pleased to do for him and communicate unto him; and Jesus Christ to be the great and *only way* and means whereby he will communicate of himself, and bring us unto himself. The more clearly any portion of Scripture discovers and makes conspicuous this end,—the more parts of the series and order of things whereby the last and utmost end of the glory of God is produced, in their mutual connection, dependence, and subserviency, it manifesteth,—the more fully doth it express this general end of the whole, and thereby evince its own interest therein.

Now, herein doth this Epistle come behind no other portion of Scripture whatever; for as the exaltation of the glory of God, as he is the first cause and last end of all things, is expressly proposed in it, so the relation of the glory of God and of our obedience and blessedness, whereby and wherein it is declared, unto the person, offices, and mediation, of Jesus Christ, is in an eminent manner insisted on and unfolded in it. And whereas some parts of Scripture do exhibit unto us most clearly some one part of this general end of the whole, and other portions or books of it some other parts, *this expresseth the whole* and all the parts of it distinctly, from the very foundation of *calling* men to the knowledge of God and obedience, unto the utmost end of his *glorifying* himself in their salvation by Jesus Christ. Neither is there herewithal the least *alloy* or mixture of any *by, particular,* or *proper* [*personal*], end of the writer,—nothing of his honour, reputation, advantage, self-pleasing, in any thing; but all runs evenly and smoothly to the general end before proposed. And this also hath deservedly a place among the τεκμήρια of writings by divine inspiration.

26. The *style,* also, of the sacred Scripture, or φράσεως χαρακτήρ, as it is termed by Eusebius in this argument, is of deserved consideration. By the style of any writing, we understand both the *propriety* of the words, with their grammatical construction, and that *composition* of the whole which renders it *fit, decorous, elegant,* and every way meet to be used in the matter about which it is used, and for the effecting of the end which is proposed in it. I know, some bold, atheistical spirits have despised the style of the holy writers, as simple and barbarous. Among these, Angelus Politianus is generally and deservedly censured by all learned men; who was imitated in his profane contempt of it by Domitius Calderinus. And of the like

temper was Petrus Bembus, who would scarce touch the Scripture; while his own epistles are not one of them free from solecisms in grammar. Austin also confesseth that while he was yet a Manichee he had the same thoughts of it: "Visa est mihi indigna quam Tullianæ dignitati compararem;"[1]—"The Scripture seemed to me unworthy to be compared with the *excellency* of Cicero." But it must be acknowledged that these spake of the *common translations of it;* though they used that pretence to reject the study of the books themselves.

I do confess that though some translations may and do render the words of the original more properly, and better represent and insinuate the native *genius*, beauty, life, and power, of the sacred style, than some others do, yet none of them can or do express the whole excellency, elegancy, and marvellous efficacy of it, for the conveyance of its sense to the understandings and minds of men. Neither is this any reflection upon the translators, their abilities, diligence, or faithfulness, but that which the nature of the thing itself produceth. There is in the sacred Scripture, in the words wherein by the Holy Ghost it was given out, a proper, peculiar *virtue* and secret efficacy, inflaming the minds of the readers and hearers, which no diligence or wisdom of man can fully and absolutely transfer into and impress upon any other language. And those who have designed to do it by substituting the *wordy elegancies* of another tongue, to express the quickening, affecting idiotisms of them (which was the design of Castalio), have, of all others, most failed in their intention.

Neither doth this defect in translations arise from hence, that the original tongues may be more *copious* and *emphatical* than those of the translations,—which possibly may be the condition of the Greek and Latin, as Jerome often complains,—but it is from the causes before named; and therefore it is most evident in the translations of the Old Testament, when yet no man can imagine the Hebrew to be more *copious* (though it be more comprehensive) than the languages whereinto it hath been translated. But it is of the originals themselves, and the style of the sacred penmen therein, concerning which we discourse. And herein the boldness of Jerome cannot be excused (though he be followed by some others of great name in later ages), who more than once chargeth St Paul with *solecisms* and *barbarisms* in expression, and often urgeth (upon a mistake, as we shall see) that he was "imperitus sermone,"—"unskilful in speech." But as neither he nor any else are able to give any cogent instance to make good their charge, so it is certain that there is nothing expressed in the whole Scripture, but in the *manner* and way, and by the words wherewith, it ought to be expressed, unto the ends for which it is used and designed, as might easily be manifested both from the

[1] Confess. lib. iii. cap. v.

intent of the Holy Ghost himself in suggesting those words unto his penmen, and in the care of God over the very iotas and tittles of the words themselves. And wherever there appears unto us an irregularity from the *arbitrary directions* or usages of other men in those languages, it doth much more become us to suspect our own apprehensions and judgment,—yea, or to reject those directions and usages from the sovereignty of an absolute rule,—than to reflect the least failure or mistake on them who wrote nothing but by *divine inspiration.* The censure of Heinsius in this matter is *severe* but true, Prolegom. Aristarch. Sac.: "Vellicare aliquid in illis, aut desiderare, non est eruditi sed blasphemi hominis, ac male feriati, qui nunquam intelligit quæ humana sit conditio, aut quanta debeatur reverentia ac cultus cuncta dispensanti Deo, qui non judicem, sed supplicem deposcit."

27. Neither hath their success been much better who have exercised their *critical* ability in judging of the *style of the particular writers* of the Scripture, preferring one before and above another; whereas the style of every one of them is best suited to the subject-matter whereof he treats, and the end aimed at, and the persons with whom he had to do. And herein Jerome hath led the way to others, and drawn many into a common mistake. The style of Isaiah, he says, is proper, urbane, high, and excellent; but that of Hosea, and especially of Amos, low, plain, improper, savouring of the country, and his profession, who was a shepherd.[1] But those that understand their style and language will not easily give consent unto him, though the report be commonly admitted by the most. It is true, there appeareth in Isaiah an excellent πάθος in his exhortations, expostulations, and comminations; attended with efficacious apostrophes, prosopopœias, metaphors, and allusions; a compacted fulness in his prophecies and predictions, a sweet evangelical spiritualness in his expression of promises, with frequent paronomasias and ellipses, which have a special elegancy in that language; whence he is usually instanced in by learned men as an example of the eloquence of the divine writings, and his δεινότης preferred unto that of Æschines, Demosthenes, or Cicero:[2] but the reader must take heed that he look not for the peculiar excellencies of that prophet absolutely in the *words* used by him, but rather in the *things* that it pleased the Holy Ghost to use him as his instrument in the revelation of. But the other part of Jerome's censure is utterly devoid of any good foundation. The style of Amos, considering the subject-matter that he treateth of and the persons with whom he

[1] Præf. in Esaiam et Amosum. [2] Franciscus Picus, Exam. Doct. Gent. lib. ii. cap. ii.; Bibliander. de Ratione Discendi Hebræ.; Mornæus de Veritat. Christ. Relig cap. xxvi.; Rivet. Isagog. ad Sac. Script. cap. xxviii.; Glassius, Philol. Sac. Præf. ad Rhetor.; Origen. tom. iv. in Evang. Johan.; Hieron. Epist cli. ad Algas; Cornelius a Lapide Præf. in Epist. Paul.

had to do, in suiting of words and speech, wherein all true, *solid eloquence* consisteth, is every way as proper, as elegant, as that of Isaiah. Neither will the *knowing reader* find him wanting in any of the celebrated styles of writing, where occasion unto them is administered. Thus some affirm that St Paul used sundry expressions (and they instance in 1 Cor. iv. 3, Col. ii. 18) that were proper to the Cilicians, his countrymen, and not so proper as to the purity of that language wherein he wrote; but as the first of the expressions they instance in is a Hebraism, and the latter purely Greek, so indeed they will discover a Tarsian defect in St Paul, together with the Patavinity in Livy that Pollio noted in him.

28. Eloquence and propriety of speech, for the proper ends of them, are the gift of God, Exod. iv. 10, 11; and therefore, unless pregnant instances may be given to the contrary, it may well be thought and expected that they should not be wanting in books written by his own inspiration. Nor indeed are they; only we are not able to give a right measure of what doth truly and *absolutely* belong unto them. He that shall look for a flourish of painted words, artificial, meretricious ornaments of speech, discourse suited to entice, inveigle, and work upon, weak and carnal affections; or sophistical, captious ways of reasoning, to deceive; or that "suada," or πιθανολογία, that smooth and harmonious structure of periods, wherein the great Roman orator gloried, the "lenocinia verborum," the ὕψος and "grandiloquentia," of some of the heathens, in the Scripture, will be mistaken in his aim. Such things become not the authority, majesty, greatness, and holiness, of Him who speaks therein. An earthly monarch that should make use of them in his edicts, laws, or proclamations, would but prostitute his authority to contempt, and invite his subjects to disobedience by so doing. How much more would they unbecome the declaration of His mind and will, given unto *poor worms*, who is the great possessor of heaven and earth!

Besides, these things belong not indeed unto real eloquence and propriety of speech, but are arbitrarily invented *crutches*, for the relief of our lameness and infirmity. Men despairing to affect the minds of others with the things themselves which they had to propose unto them, and acquainted with the baits that are meet to take hold of their brutish affections, with the ways of prepossessing their minds with prejudice, or casting a mist before their understandings, that they may not discern the nature, worth, and excellency, of truth, have invented such dispositions of words as might compass the ends they aimed at. And great effects by this means were produced; as by him whom men admired,—

—— "Pleni moderantem frena theatri."

And therefore the apostle tells us, that the rejecting of this kind

of oratory in his preaching and writing was of indispensable necessity; that it might appear that the effects of them were not any way *influenced* thereby, but were the genuine productions of the things themselves which he delivered, 1 Cor. ii. 4–7. This kind of eloquence, then, the Scripture maketh no use of, but rather condemneth its application unto the great and holy things whereof it treateth, as unbecoming their excellency and majesty. So Origen to this purpose: "Ἴσως γὰρ εἰ κάλλος καὶ περιβολὴν φράσεως, ὡς τὰ παρ' Ἕλλησι θαυμαζόμενα, εἶχεν ἡ γραφή, ὑπενόησεν ἄν τις οὐ τὴν ἀλήθειαν κεκρατηκέναι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐμφαινομένην ἀκολουθίαν καὶ τὸ τῆς φράσεως κάλλος ἐψυχαγωγηκέναι τοὺς ἀκροωμένους, καὶ εὐαπατήτους αὐτοὺς προσειληφέναι, tom. iv. in Johan.;—"If the holy Scripture had used that elegancy and choice of speech which are admired among the Greeks, one might have suspected that it was not truth itself that conquered men, but that they had been circumvented and deceived by appearing or fallacious consequences, and the splendour or elegancy of speech."

29. That the proper excellency of speech or style consisteth in the τὸ πρέπον, or meet accommodation of words unto things, with consideration of the person that useth them, and the end whereunto they are applied, all men that have any acquaintance with these things will confess. Βούλεται ἡ φύσις τοῖς νοήμασιν ἕπεσθαι τὴν λέξιν, οὐ τῇ λέξει τὰ νοήματα, saith Dionysius of Halicarnassus;—"Nature requireth that words should follow, or be made to serve, sentences or things, and not things be subservient to words:"[1] whence the too curious observation of words hath been censured as an argument of an infirm and abject mind.[2] However, it may be pardoned in them who placed all their excellency in πιθανολογία, and disposing persuasive, alluring words; as Isocrates spent ten years in his Panegyrics, and Plato ceased not unto the eightieth year of his age to adorn his Discourses, as Dionysius testifies of them both.

30. The *style of the holy Scripture* is every way answerable unto what may rationally be expected from it; for,—

(1.) *It becometh the majesty, authority, and holiness, of Him in whose name it speaketh.* And hence it is that, by its simplicity without corruption, gravity without affectation, plainness without alluring ornaments, it doth not so much entice, move, or persuade, as constrain, press, and pierce into the mind and affections, transforming them into a likeness of the things which it delivers unto us.[3] And therefore, though St Paul says that he dealt not with the Corinthians καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας, in an excellency or sublimity of speech or wisdom, like that of the orators before described, yet he did ἐν ἀποδείξει Πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, in such an evidence of spiritual power as was far more effectual and prevalent. The

[1] Dion. Halicar. Tractat. de Isoc. cap. xii. [2] Senec. Epist. cxv. [3] Picus Mirand. Epist. ad Hermol. Barbar.

whole of the sacred style is θεοπρεπές, if truth, gravity, authority, and majesty, can render it so; nor can any instance be given to the contrary. And,—

(2.) *It everywhere becometh the subject-matter it treateth of,* which because it is various, it is impossible that the style wherein it is expressed should be uniform; when yet, notwithstanding all its variety, it everywhere keeps its own property,—to be, in gravity and authority, still *like* unto itself, and *unlike* to or distinct from all other writings whatsoever. Whence Austin rightly of the holy penmen: "Audeo dicere omnes qui recte intelligunt quod illi loquuntur, simul intelligere non eos aliter loqui debuisse;"—"I dare say that whosoever understands what they speak, will also understand that they ought not to have spoken otherwise."[1] And Origen of the writings of St Paul in particular: "If any one," saith he, "give himself to the diligent reading of his epistles, εὖ οἶδ', ἢ θαυμάσεται τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐν ἰδιωτικῇ λέξει μεγάλα περινοοῦντος, ἢ μὴ θαυμάσας αὐτὸς καταγέλαστος φανεῖται, I know full well that either he will admire his great conceptions and sentences under a plain and vulgar style, or he will show himself very ridiculous." The things treated of in the Scripture are, for the most part, heavenly, spiritual, supernatural, divine; and nothing can be more fond than to look for such things to be expressed in a flourish of words, and with various ornaments of speech, fit to lead away the minds of men from that which they are designed wholly to be gathered unto the admiration and contemplation of. Bodies that have a native beauty and harmony in the composition of their parts, are advantaged more by being clothed with fit garments than by the ornaments of gay attire. And the spiritual, native beauty of heavenly truths is better conveyed unto the minds of men by words and expressions fitted unto it plainly and simply, than by any ornaments of enticing speech whatever. And therefore we say, with Austin, that there is not any thing delivered in the Scripture but *just as it ought to be,* and as the matter requires.

(3.) The style of the holy penmen is, in a gracious condescension, *suited unto them, and their capacity,* whereof far the greatest part of them with whom they had to do consisted. This Origen at large insists upon in the beginning of his fifth book against Celsus. The philosophy and oratory of the heathen were suited principally, if not solely, to their capacity that were learned: this the authors and professors of it aimed at,—namely, that they might approve their skill and ability unto those who were able to judge of them. The Scripture was written for the good of mankind in general,[2] and without the least design of any contemperation of itself to the learning and wisdom of men; and this συγκατάβασις, or condescension unto

[1] August. de Doct. Christ. lib. iv. cap. vi. [2] Hilar. in Ps. cxxvi.

the common reason, sense, usage, and experience, of mankind in general, is very admirable in the holy penmen, and absolutely peculiar unto them. In this *universal suitableness* unto all the concernments of it consists that excellent simplicity of the Scripture style, whereby it plainly and openly, without fraudulent ornaments, in common and usual speech, declares things divine, spiritual, and heavenly, with a holy accommodation of them to the understanding and capacities of men, in such occasional variety as yet never diverts from those properties and characters wherein the uniformity of the whole doth consist.

31. Besides all these excellencies of the style of holy writ, with others that may be added unto them, there is in it a secret *energy* and efficacy, for the subjecting of the minds of men unto its intention in all things. Whether this proceed and be imparted unto it only from the matters treated of, which are holy and heavenly, or whether it be communicated unto it immediately by an impression of His authority upon it by whom it is given out, or whether it arise from both of them, all that are conversant in it with faith and reverence do find the truth of our assertion by experience. And Origen, amongst others, speaks excellently to this purpose: *Φησὶ δ' ὁ θεῖος λόγος, οὐκ αὔταρκες εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον (κἂν κατ' αὐτὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ πιστικώτατον) πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ δύναμις τὶς θεόθεν δοθῇ τῷ λέγοντι, καὶ χάρις ἐπανθήσῃ τοῖς λεγομένοις, καὶ αὕτη οὐκ ἀθεεὶ ἐγγινομένη τοῖς ἀνυσίμως λέγουσι*·—"The holy Scripture teacheth us that what is spoken, though in itself it be true and fit to persuade, is not able to conquer the minds of men, unless power from God be communicated to the speaker, and grace [from him] do flourish in the things spoken themselves; and it is not without divine influence that they speak with efficacy." Hence ariseth the spiritual, peculiar *δεινότης* of the divine writers, termed by St Paul *ἀπόδειξις Πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως*,—"the demonstration of the Spirit and of power." And herein, as on other accounts, the "word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword," Heb. iv. 12; by which living energy and authority it evacuated and brought to nought all the wisdom in this world,—that is, all philosophical conceptions, with all the ornaments of eloquence and oratory. The excellent discourse of Austin on this subject, de Doctrina Christiana, lib. iv. cap. vi., is very well worthy consideration; whither I refer the reader, that I may not too far divert from my present particular design.

Whatever hath been thus spoken concerning the style of the sacred Scripture in general, it is as applicable unto this Epistle unto the Hebrews as to any one portion of holy writ whatever. That simplicity, gravity, unaffectedness, suitableness to its author, matter, and end, which commend the whole unto us, are eminent in this part of it; that authority, efficacy, and energy, which are implanted

on the whole by Him who supplied both sense and words unto the penmen of it, exert themselves in this Epistle also.

No defect in any of these can be charged on it that should argue it of any other extract than the whole. Nothing so far singular as to be inconsistent with that harmony which, in all their variety, there is among the books of the holy Scripture, as to the style and kind of speech, is anywhere to be found in it. If anywhere, as in the beginning of the first chapter, the style seems to swell in its current above the ordinary banks of the writings of the New Testament, it is from the greatness and sublimity of the matter treated on, which was not capable of any other kind of expression. Doth the penman of it anywhere use words or phrases not commonly, or rarely, or perhaps nowhere else, used in the sense and way wherein they are by him applied?—it is because his matter is peculiar, and not elsewhere handled, at least not on the same principles nor to the same purpose as by him. Doth he oftentimes speak in an old testament dialect, pressing words and expressions to the service and sense they were employed in under the tabernacle and temple, after they had been manumitted, as it were, and made free from their typical importance in the service and spiritual sense of the gospel?—it is from the consideration of their state and condition with whom in an especial manner he had to do; and this in perfect harmony with the wisdom of the Holy Ghost in other portions of Scripture. So that on this account also its station in the holy canon is secured.

32. Moreover, besides the peculiar excellency which is found in the style of the holy Scripture, either evidencing its divine original, or at least manifesting that there is nothing in it unworthy of such an extract, the *authority* of its principal Author exerts itself in the whole of it unto the consciences of men. And herein is this Epistle an especial sharer also. Now, this authority, as it respects the minds of men, is in part an exsurgency of the *holy matter* contained in it and the *heavenly manner* wherein it is declared. They have in their conjunction a peculiar character, differencing this writing from all writings of a human original, and manifesting it to be of God. Neither can it otherwise be, but that things of divine revelation, expressed in words of divine suggestion and determination, will appear to be of a divine original. And partly it consists in an ineffable emanation of divine excellency, communicating unto his own word a distinguishing property, from its relation unto him. We speak not now of the work of the Holy Ghost in our hearts by his grace, enabling us to believe, but of his work in the word, rendering it credible and meet to be believed; not of the seal and testimony that he gives unto the hearts of individual persons of the truth of the Scripture, or rather of the things contained in it, but of the seal and testimony which in the Scripture he gives unto it and by it to be his

own work and word. Such a character have the works of other agents, whereby they are known and discerned to be theirs. By such properties are the works of men discerned, and oftentimes of individuals amongst them. They bear the likeness of their authors, and are thereby known to be theirs. Neither is it possible that there should be any work of God proceeding so immediately from him as do writings by divine inspiration, but there will be such a communication of his Spirit and likeness unto it, such an impression of his greatness, holiness, goodness, truth, and majesty, upon it, as will manifest it to be from him. The false prophets of old pretended their dreams, visions, predictions, and revelations, to be from him. They prefixed נְאֻם, "He saith," unto all the declarations of them, Jer. xxiii. 31; and therefore doubtless framed them to as great a likeness unto those that were by inspiration from him as they were able: and yet the Lord declares that all their imaginations were as discernible from his word as chaff from wheat; and this by that authority and power wherewith his word is accompanied, whereof they were utterly destitute, ver. 28, 29. And this authority do all they who have their senses exercised in it find and acknowledge in this Epistle, wherein their minds and consciences do acquiesce. They hear and understand the *voice of God* in it; and, by that Spirit which is promised unto them, discern it from the *voice of a stranger*. And when their minds are prepared and fortified against objections by the former considerations, this they ultimately resolve their persuasion of its divine authority into; for,—

33. From this authority they find a *divine efficacy* proceeding, a powerful operation upon their souls and consciences, unto all the ends of the Scripture. A reverence and awe of God, from his authority shining forth and exerting itself in it, being wrought in them, they find their minds effectually brought into captivity unto the obedience taught therein.

This efficacy and power is in the whole word of God: "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the LORD; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. xxiii. 29; that is, "living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," Heb. iv. 12. As it hath an ἐξουσία, or "authority" over men, Matt. vii. 29, so it hath a δύναμις, or "powerful efficacy" in and towards them, Acts xx. 32, James i. 21: yea, it is the "power of God" himself for its proper end, Rom. i. 16, and therefore said to be accompanied with the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power," 1 Cor. ii. 4; a demonstration ὑπὲρ τὰς λογικὰς μεθόδους τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς συγκατάθεσιν ἕλκουσα, as Basil,[1] —drawing the soul to consent beyond the efficacy of rational or logi-

[1] Basil. in Ps. cxv.

cal arguments, or geometrical demonstrations, as he adds in the same place. And this divine power and efficacy of the word, as to all the ends of it, proceeding from the authority of God in it, with his designation of it unto those ends (which is that which giveth energy unto all things, enabling them to produce their proper effects, and setting limits and bounds to their operation), as it is testified unto in innumerable places of the Scripture itself, so it hath and doth sufficiently manifest and evidence itself, both in the fruits and effects of it on the souls of particular persons, and in that work which it hath wrought and doth yet carry on invisibly in the world, in despite of all the opposition that is made unto it by the power of hell, in conjunction with the unbelief, darkness, and lusts of the minds of men; as may elsewhere be more at large declared.

A learned man said well, "Non monent, non persuadent sacræ literæ, sed cogunt, agitant, vim inferunt; legis rudia verba et agrestia, sed viva, sed animata, flammea, aculeata, ad imum spiritum penetrantia, hominem totum potestate mirabili transformantia;"[1] expressing the sum of what we discourse. From hence is all that supernatural light and knowledge, that conviction and restraint, that conversion, faith, consolation, and obedience, that are found amongst any of the sons of men. Πᾶσα Γραφὴ, saith Basil, θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, διὰ τοῦτο συγγραφεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἵν' ὥσπερ ἐν κοινῷ τῶν ψυχῶν ἰατρείῳ, πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὸ ἴαμα τοῦ οἰκείου πάθους ἕκαστος ἐκλεγώμεθα·—"The whole Scripture is divinely inspired and profitable, being written by the Holy Ghost for this purpose, that in it, as a common healing office for souls, all men may choose the medicine suited to cure their own distempers."[2] Such is the nature, power, and efficacy of this Epistle, towards them that do believe. It searches their hearts, discovers their thoughts, principles their consciences, judges their acts inward and outward, supports their spirits, comforts their souls, enlightens their minds, guides them in their hope, confidence, and love to God, directs them in all their communion with him and obedience unto him, and leads them to an enjoyment of him. And this work of the Holy Ghost in it and by it seals its divine authority unto them; so that they find rest, spiritual satisfaction, and great assurance therein. When once they have obtained this experience of its divine power, it is in vain for men or devils to oppose its canonical authority with their frivolous cavils and objections. Neither is this experience merely satisfactory to themselves alone, as is by some pretended. It is a thing *pleadable*, and that not only in their own defence, to strengthen their faith against temptations, but to others also; though not to atheistical scoffers, yet to humble inquirers,—which ought to be the frame of all men in the investigation of sacred truths.

[1] Picus Mirand. Epist. ad Hermol. Barbar. [2] Basil. in Ps. i.

34. Unto what hath been spoken we may add, that the *canonical authority* of this Epistle is confirmed unto us by *catholic tradition.* By this *tradition* I intend not the testimony only of the *present church* that is in the world, nor fancy a trust of a power to declare what is so in any church whatever; but a general, *uninterrupted fame,* conveyed and confirmed by particular instances, records, and testimonies, in all ages. In any other sense, how little weight there is to be laid upon traditions we have a pregnant instance in him who first began to magnify them. This was Papias, a contemporary of Polycarp, in the very next age after the apostles. Tradition of what was done or said by Christ or the apostles, what expositions they gave, he professed himself to set a high value upon,—equal to, if not above the Scripture. And two things are considerable in his search after them:—(1.) That he did not think that there was any church appointed to be the preserver and declarer of apostolical traditions, but made his inquiry of all the individual ancient men that he could meet withal who had conversed with any of the apostles. (2.) That, by all his pains, he gathered together a rhapsody of incredible stories, fables, errors, and useless curiosities.[1] Such issue will the endeavours of men have who forsake the stable word of prophecy to follow rumours and reports, under the specious name of traditions! But this catholic fame whereof we speak, confirmed by particular instances and records in all ages, testifying unto a matter of fact, is of great importance. And how clearly this may be pleaded in our present case shall be manifested in our investigation of the penman of this Epistle.

And thus, I hope, we have made it evident that this Epistle is not destitute of any one of those τεκμήρια, or infallible proofs and arguments whereby any particular book of the Scripture evinceth itself unto the consciences of men to be written by inspiration from God. It remaineth now to show that *it is not liable unto any of those exceptions* or arguments whereby any book or writing pretending a claim to a divine original, and canonical authority thereupon, may be convicted and manifested to be of another extract; whereby its just privilege will be on both sides secured.

35. The first consideration of this nature is taken from the author or penman of any such writing. The books of the Old Testament were all of them written by prophets or holy men inspired of God. Hence St Peter calls the whole of it Προφητεία, "Prophecy," 2 Pet. i. 21,—prophecy delivered by men, acted or moved therein by the Holy Ghost. And though there be a distribution made of the several books of it, from the subject-matter, into the "Law, Prophets, and Psalms," Luke xxiv. 44, and often into the "Law and Prophets," on the same account, as Acts xxiv. 14, xxvi. 22, Rom. iii. 21, yet their penmen being all equally prophets, the whole in general is ascribed unto them,

[1] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. iii. cap. ult.

and called "Prophecy," Rom. i. 2, xvi. 26; Luke xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. i. 19. So were the books of the New Testament written by apostles, or men endowed with an apostolical spirit; and in their work they were equally inspired by the Holy Ghost; whence the church is said to be "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," Eph. ii. 20. If, then, the author of any writing acknowledgeth himself, or may otherwise be convinced, to have been neither prophet nor apostle, nor endued with the same infallible Spirit with them, his work, how excellent soever otherwise it may appear, must needs be esteemed a mere fruit of his own skill, diligence, and wisdom, and not any way to belong unto the canon of the Scripture. This is the condition, for instance, of the second book of Maccabees. In the close of it, the author, being doubtful what acceptance his endeavours and manner of writing would find amongst his readers, makes his excuse, and affirms that he did his utmost to please them in his style and composition of his words. So he tells us before, chap. ii. 23, that he did but epitomize the history of Jason the Cyrenean, wherein he took great pains and labour. The truth is, he who had before commended Judas Maccabæus for offering sacrifices for the dead (which indeed he did not, but for the living), nowhere appointed in the law, and affirmed that Jeremiah hid the holy fire, ark, tabernacle, and altar of incense, in a cave; [who says] that the same person, Antiochus, was killed at Nanea in Persia chap. i. 16, and died in the mountains of torments in his bowels, as he was coming to Judea, chap. ix., whom the first book affirms to have died of sorrow at Babylon, chap. vi. 16; and who affirms Judas to have written letters to Aristobulus in the one hundred and eighty-eighth year of the Seleucian empire, who was slain in the one hundred and fifty-second year of it, book i. chap. i. 10,—that is, thirty-six years after his death!—with many other such mistakes and falsehoods; had no great need to inform us that he had no special divine assistance in his writing, but leaned unto his own understanding. But yet this he doth, and that openly, as we showed: for the Holy Ghost will not be an epitomizer of a profane writing, as he professeth himself to have been; nor make excuses for his weakness, nor declare his pains and sweat in his work, as he doth. And yet, to that pass are things brought in the world, by custom, prejudice, love of reputation, scorn to be esteemed mistaken in any thing, that many earnestly contend for this book to be written by divine inspiration, when the author of it himself openly professeth it to have been of another extract; for although this book be not only rejected out of the canon by the council of Laodicea,[1] Jerome,[2] and others of the ancients, but by Gregory the Great,[3] bishop of Rome, himself, yet the church of Rome would

[1] Synod. Laod. cap. lix. [2] Hieron. Cat. Viror. Illust. in Joseph. [3] Gregor. Mor. lib. xix. cap. xvi.

now by force thrust it thereinto. But were the author himself alive again, I am so well persuaded of his ingenuity and honesty, from the conclusion of his story, that [I am sure] they would never be able to make him say that he wrote by *divine inspiration;* and little reason, then, have we to believe it. Now, this Epistle is free from this exception. The penman of it doth nowhere intimate, directly or indirectly, that he wrote in his own strength or by his own ability; which yet if he had done, in an argument of that nature which he insisted on, [it] had been incumbent on him to have declared, that he might not lead the church into a pernicious error, in embracing that as given by inspiration from God which was but a fruit of his diligence and fallible endeavours. But, on the contrary, he speaks as in the name of God, referring unto him all that he delivers; nor can he, in any minute instance, be convicted to have wanted his assistance.

36. *Circumstances* of the general argument of a book may also convince it of a human or fallible original. This they do, for instance, in the book of Judith;—for such a Nabuchodonosor as should reign in Nineve, chap. i. 1, and make war with Arphaxad, king of Ecbatane, verse 13; whose captains and officers should know nothing at all of the nation of the Jews, chap. v. 3, that waged war against them in the days of Joakim (or, as other copies, Eliakim) the high priest, chap. iv. 6; after whose defeat the Jews should have peace for eighty years at the least, chap. xvi. 23, 25; is an imagination of that which never had subsistence "in rerum natura:" or [the book may be] a representation of what יְהוּדִית, a Jewish woman ought, as the author of it conceived, to undertake for the good of her country. Setting aside the consideration of all other discoveries of the fallibility of the whole discourse, this alone is sufficient to impeach its reputation. Our Epistle is no way obnoxious unto any exception of this nature. Yea, the state of things in the churches of God, and among the Hebrews in particular, did at that time administer so just and full occasion unto a writing of this kind, as gives countenance unto its ascription unto the *wisdom and care* of the Holy Ghost. For if the eruption of the poisonous brood of heretics, questioning the *deity* of the Son of God, in Corinthus, gave *occasion* to the writing of the Gospel by St John; and if the *dissensions* in the church of Corinth deserved *two epistles* for their composition; and if the lesser differences between believers of the Jews and Gentiles, in and about the things treated of in this Epistle, had a remedy provided for them in the epistles of St Paul unto them; is it not at least *probable* that the same Spirit who moved the penmen of those books to write, and directed them in their so doing, did also provide for the removal of the prejudices and healing of the distempers of the Hebrews, which were so great, and of so great importance unto all the churches of God? And that

there is weight in this consideration will evidently appear, when we come to declare the *time* when this Epistle was written.

37. The most manifest eviction of any writing pretending unto the privilege of divine inspiration may be taken from the *subject-matter* of it, or the things taught and declared therein. God himself being the first and only *essential Truth*, nothing can proceed from him but what is absolutely so; and truth being but *one*, every way *uniform* and consonant unto itself, there can be no *discrepancy* in the branches of it, nor *contrariety* in the streams that flow from that one fountain. God is also *holy*, "glorious in holiness," and nothing proceeds immediately from him but it bears a stamp of his holiness, as also of his greatness and wisdom. If, then, any thing in the *subject-matter* of any writing be *untrue*, *impious*, *light*, or any way *contradictory* to the *ascertained writings of divine inspiration*, all pleas and pretences unto that privilege must cease for ever. We need no other proof, testimony, or argument, to evince its original, than what itself tenders unto us. And by this means, also, do the books commonly called apocryphal, unto which the Romanists ascribe canonical authority, destroy their own pretensions. They have all of them, on this account, long since been cast out of the limits of any tolerable defence. Now, that no one portion of Scripture is less obnoxious to any exception of this kind, from the *subject-matter* treated of and doctrines delivered in it, than this Epistle, we shall, by God's assistance, manifest in our exposition of the whole and each particular passage of it. Neither is it needful that we should here prolong our discourse, by anticipating any thing that must necessarily afterwards, in its proper place, be insisted on. The place startled at by some, chap. vi., about the *impossibility of the recovery of apostates*, was touched on before, and shall afterwards be fully cleared. Nor do I know any other use to be made of observing the scruple of some of old, about the countenance given to the Novatians by that place, but only to make a discovery how *partially* men in all ages have been addicted unto their own apprehensions in things wherein they differed from others; for whereas, if the opinion of the Novatians had been confirmed in the place, as it is not, it had been their duty to have relinquished their own *hypothesis* and gone over unto them, some of them discovered a mind rather to have broken in upon the *authority* of God himself, declared in his word, than so to have done. And it is greatly to be feared that the same spirit still working in others, is as effectual in them to reject the *plain sense of the Scripture* in sundry places, as it was ready to have been in them to reject the *words* of it in this.

38. The *style* and *method* of a writing may be such as to lay a *just prejudice* against its claim to *canonical authority:* for although the *subject-matter* of a writing may be good and honest in the main

of it, and generally suited unto the *analogy* of faith, yet there may be, in the *manner* of its composure and writing, such an *ostentation* of wit, fancy, learning, or eloquence; such an *affectation* of words, phrases, and expressions; such *rhetorical* painting of things small and inconsiderable; as may sufficiently demonstrate *human* ambition, ignorance, pride, or desire of applause, to have been mixed in the forming and producing of it. Much of this Jerome[1] observes, in particular concerning the book entitled the Wisdom of Solomon; written, as it is supposed, by Philo, an eloquent and learned man: "Redolet Græcam eloquentiam." This consideration is of deserved moment in the judgment we are to make of the spring or fountain from whence any book doth proceed; for whereas great *variety of style*, and in manner of writing, may be observed in the penmen of canonical Scripture, yet in no one of them do the least footsteps of the failings and sinful infirmities of corrupted nature before mentioned appear. When, therefore, they manifest themselves, they cast out the writings wherein they are from that harmony and consent which in general appears amongst all the books of divine inspiration. Of the *style* of this Epistle we have spoken before. Its gravity, simplicity, majesty, and absolute suitableness unto the high, holy, and heavenly mysteries treated of in it, are, as far as I can find, not only very evident, but also by all acknowledged, who are able to judge of them.

39. Want of *catholic tradition in all ages* of the church, from the first giving forth of any writing testifying unto its divine original, is another impeachment of its pretence unto canonical authority. And this argument ariseth fatally against the *apocryphal* books before mentioned. Some of them are expressly excluded from the canon by many of the ancient churches, nor are any of them competently testified unto.

The suffrage of this kind given unto our Epistle we have mentioned before. The doubts and scruples of some about it have likewise been acknowledged. That they are of no weight, to be laid in the balance against the *testimony* given unto it, might easily be demonstrated. But because they were levied all of them principally against its *author*, and but by consequence against its *authority*, I shall consider them in a disquisition about him; wherein we shall give a further confirmation of the *divine original* of the Epistle, by proving it undeniably to be written by the apostle St Paul, that eminent penman of the Holy Ghost.

40. Thus *clear* stands the *canonical authority* of this Epistle. It is *destitute of no evidence needful* for the manifestation of it, nor is it *obnoxious unto any just exception* against its claim to that privilege. And hence it is come to pass, that, whatever have been the

[1] Hieron. Præf. in Prov. Solom.

fears, doubts, and scruples of some; the *rash*, temerarious objections, conjectures, and censures of others; the *care* and providence of God over it, as a parcel of his most holy word, working with the prevailing evidence of its *original* implanted in it, and its spiritual efficacy unto all the ends of holy Scripture, hath obtained an *absolute conquest* over the hearts and minds of all that believe, and settled it in a full possession of *canonical authority* in all the churches of Christ throughout the world.

SUBSIDIARY NOTE ON EXERCITATION I.

BY THE EDITOR.

It will be seen that Dr Owen, in his proof of the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, relies chiefly upon *internal* evidence. After a definition of canonicity, according to which it is represented as including two elements,—the *origin* of the document for which canonical authority is claimed, as a divine communication to man; and the *design* of it, as intended to be a permanent and universal rule to the church: and after a historical summary of the different parties by whom the Epistle has been positively rejected, or not expressly owned as canonical: he refutes four objections which have been urged against its authority,—the uncertainty respecting its author; quotations alleged in the Epistle to be taken from the Old Testament Scriptures, but not found in them; quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures which are not to the purpose of the author; and passages which appear to sanction exploded heresies. He then argues from three criteria of Eusebius in proof of its canonicity,—its *subject-matter*, its *design*, and its prevailing spirit or *style*. He supplements his argument by an appeal to catholic tradition.

His subsequent Exercitation, proving that Paul was the author of the Epistle, yields further evidence of its canonical authority, the canonicity of a book resting generally on the fact of its apostolic origin: and under a discussion of its Pauline authorship, the question of the right of the Epistle to a place in the canon has frequently been considered.

Independently, however, of the question of its authorship, there are *external* evidences of its canonical authority, on which, in modern times, considerable stress has been justly placed:—1. The ANTIQUITY of the document, as it appears to have been written while the rites and worship of the temple were still in existence, Heb. ix. 9, 25, viii. 5; and because the argument contained in it against temptations to apostasy supposes the continued performance of those rites in the Jewish temple by which the converts might be induced to relapse into their previous Judaism. 2. The quotations from the Epistle to the Hebrews by CLEMENT of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, which was written before the close of the first century, and most probably about A.D. 96. These quotations are numerous, and are arranged by Moses Stuart into four classes, according to the degree of their correspondence with the original Epistle from which they were taken. They prove more than the existence of the Epistle antecedently to A.D. 96. Clement, in the 36th chapter of his epistle, introduces a quotation from Scripture under the common formula that bespeaks an appeal to divine authority: Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως· Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα. Was this quotation taken by Clement from Ps civ. 4, or from Heb. i. 7? If from the latter, the formula with which it is introduced proves the canonical authority of the Epistle from which it is taken. Bleek and Tholuck contend that the quotation is taken directly from the psalm; Stuart and Davidson, that it is from the Epistle to the Hebrews, arguing that, from the context in the passage from Clement, his design in using the formula, Γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, is to assign a reason for the authoritative application of the psalm to Christ, and authority for such an application can be found only in Heb. i. 3. JUSTIN MARTYR, A.D. 140, has the following passage in his dialogue with

Trypho the Jew. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, καὶ αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς ὑψίστου ὑπάρχων. Elsewhere he calls Christ, αἰώνιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερέα καὶ βασιλέα, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γενέσθαι, and Apoleg. i. p. 95, he says of Christ. Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος. Nowhere but in the Epistle to the Hebrews do we find such epithets applied to Christ as a "priest after the order of Melchizedek," the "king of Salem," an "eternal priest," "angel and apostle." And, 4. The Epistle to the Hebrews is contained in the PESHITO, or old Syriac version, which is ascribed to the second century. "When we consider," says Davidson, "that the Peshito wanted several epistles which were not generally received as authentic so soon as the other books, the fact in question forms an important part of the early evidence favourable to our Epistle's canonical reputation."

It must further be borne in mind, that those who discredit the Pauline authorship of the Epistle are not necessarily to be held as impugning its canonicity. Olshausen and Tholuck are decided in maintaining the latter, although both, with Luther, suppose Apollos to have been the author of the Epistle. Olshausen maintains its canonical authority,—1. Because we cannot, except on the supposition that Paul had an essential share in the composition of it, explain the remarkable circumstance, that the entire oriental church attributed it to Paul; 2. Because, though the style is not that of Paul, the tenor of the ideas bears a resemblance, not to be mistaken, to the writings which are acknowledged to be his; and, 3. Because, on this supposition, all the circumstances in regard to the Epistle are explained, the western church knowing that Paul was not its author, and therefore not using it much, though not rejecting it, the eastern recognising the essential influence he exerted over its composition, though the truths contained in it were presented through the medium of a faithful disciple like Apollos.

EXERCITATION II.

OF THE PENMAN OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

1. Knowledge of the penman of any part of Scripture not necessary—Some of them utterly concealed—The word of God gives authority unto them that deliver it, not the contrary—Prophets, in things wherein they are not actually inspired, subject to mistakes. 2. St Paul the writer of this Epistle—The hesitation of Origen—Heads of evidence. 3. Uncertainty of them who assign any other author. 4. St Luke not the writer of it; 5. Nor Barnabas.

The Epistle under his name counterfeit—His writing of this Epistle by sundry reasons disproved. 6. Not Apollos; 7. Nor Clemens; 8 Nor Tertullian. 9. Objections against St Paul's being the penman—Dissimilitude of style—Admitted by the ancients. 10. Answer of Origen rejected; of Clemens, Jerome, etc., rejected likewise. 11. St Paul, in what sense ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ. 12. His eloquence and skill. 13. Causes of the difference in style between this and his other epistles. 14. Coincidence of expressions in it and them. 15. The Epistle ἀνεπίγραφος. 16. Answer of Jerome rejected; 17. Of Theodoret; 18. Of Chrysostom—Prejudice of the Jews against St Paul not the cause of the forbearance [*i.e.*, withholding] of his name. 19. The true reason thereof—The Hebrews' church-state not changed—Faith evangelical educed from Old Testament principles and testimonies—These pressed on the Hebrews; not mere apostolical authority. 20. Hesitation of the Latin church about this Epistle answered—Other exceptions from the Epistle itself removed. 21. Arguments to prove St Paul to be the writer of it—Testimony of St Peter, 2 Epist. iii. 15, 16—Considerations upon that testimony—The second Epistle of St Peter written to the same persons with the first—The first written unto the Hebrews in their dispersion—Διασπορά, what. 22. St Paul wrote an Epistle unto the same persons to whom Peter wrote—That,

this Epistle: not that to the Galatians; not one lost. 23. The "long-suffering of God," how declared to be "salvation" in this Epistle. 24. The wisdom ascribed unto St Paul in the writing of this Epistle, wherein it appears—The δυσνόητα of it—Weight of this testimony. 25. The suitableness of this Epistle unto those of the same author—Who competent judges hereof—What required thereunto. 26. Testimony of the first churches. or catholic tradition. 27. Evidences from this Epistle itself—The general argument and scope—Method—Way of arguing—All the same with St Paul's other Epistles—Skill in Judaical learning, traditions, and customs, proper to St Paul—His bonds and sufferings—His companion Timothy—His sign and token subscribed.

1. THE divine authority of the Epistle being vindicated, it is of no great moment to inquire seriously after its *penman.* Writings that proceed from divine inspiration receive no addition of authority from the reputation or esteem of them by whom they were written; and this the Holy Ghost hath sufficiently manifested by shutting up the names of many of them from the knowledge of the church in all ages. The close of the Pentateuch hath an uncertain penman, unless we shall suppose, with some of the Jews, that it was written by Moses after his death! Divers of the psalms have their penmen concealed, as also have the whole books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ruth, Esther, Job; and the Chronicles are but guessed at. Had any prejudice unto their authority ensued, this had not been. [As] for those whose authors are known, they were not esteemed to be given by prophecy because they were prophets, but they were known to be prophets by the word which they delivered: for if the word delivered, or written, by any of the prophets, was to be esteemed sacred or divine because delivered or written by such persons as were known to be prophets; then it must be because they were some other way known so to be, and divinely inspired, as by working of miracles, or that they were in their days received and testified unto as such by the church. But neither of these can be asserted. For as it is not known that any one penman of the Old Testament, Moses only excepted, ever wrought any miracles, so it is certain that the most and chiefest of them (as the prophets) were rejected and condemned by the church of the days wherein they lived. The only way, therefore, whereby they were proved to be prophets was by the *word itself* which they delivered and wrote; and thereon depended the evidence and certainty of their being divinely inspired. See Amos vii. 14–17; Jer. xxiii. 25–31. And, setting aside that actual inspiration by the Holy Ghost which they had for the declaration and writing of that word of God which came unto them in particular, the prophets themselves were subject to *mistakes.* So was Samuel, when he thought Eliab should have been the Lord's anointed, 1 Sam. xvi. 6; and Nathan, when he approved the purpose of David to build the temple, 1 Chron. xvii. 2; and the great Elijah

when he supposed none left in Israel that worshipped God aright but himself, 1 Kings xix. 14, 18. It was, then, as we said, the word of prophecy that gave the writers of it the reputation and authority of prophets; and their being prophets gave not authority to the word they declared, or wrote as a word of prophecy. Hence an anxious inquiry after the penman of any part of the Scripture is not necessary.

But whereas there want not *evidences* sufficient to discover who was the writer of this Epistle, whereby also the exceptions made unto its divine original may be finally obviated, they also shall be taken into consideration. A subject this is wherein many learned men, of old and of late, have exercised themselves, until this single argument is grown up into entire and large treatises;[1] and I shall only take care that the truth, which hath been already strenuously asserted and vindicated, may not again, by this review, be rendered dubious and questionable.

2. *St Paul it is by whom we affirm this Epistle to be written.* It is acknowledged that this was so highly questioned of old, that Origen, after the examination of it, concludes, Τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδε,—"What is the very truth in this matter God only knows."[2] However, he acknowledgeth that οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, "the ancients," owned it to be written by Paul, and that, he says, not without good reason; whereas the ascription of it unto any other he assigns unto a bare report. It may not, then, be expected that now, after so long a season, the truth of our assertion should be so manifestly evinced as to give *absolute satisfaction* unto all (which is a vain thing for any man to aim at in a subject wherein men suppose that they have a liberty of thinking what they please); yet I doubt not, but that it will appear not only highly probable, but so full of evidence, in comparison of any other opinion that is or hath been promoted in competition with it, as that some kind of *blamable pertinaciousness* may be made to appear in its refusal. Now, the whole of what I shall offer in the proof of it may be reduced unto these six heads:—(1.) The manifest *failure* of all them who have endeavoured to assign it unto any other penman; (2.) The *insufficiency* of the arguments insisted on to disprove our assertion; (3.) *Testimony* given unto it in other scriptures; (4.) *Considerations* taken from the writing itself, compared with other acknowledged writings of the same author; (5.) The general suffrage of *antiquity*, or ecclesiastical tradition; (6.) Reasons taken from sundry *circumstances* relating unto the Epistle itself. Now, as all these evidences are not of the same nature, nor of equal force, so some of them will be found very cogent, and all of them together very sufficient to free our assertion from just question or exception.

[1] Clemens, Origenes, Eusebius, Hieronymus, Theodoretus, Chrysostomus, Cajetanus, Erasmus, Camero, Grotius, et omnes fere commentatores; Freder. Span. Fil. de Auth. Epist. ad Heb. [2] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxv.

3. First, The *uncertainty* of them who question whether Paul were the writer of this Epistle, and their want of probable grounds in assigning it unto any other, hath some inducement in it to leave it unto him whose of old it was esteemed to be; for when once men began to take to themselves a liberty of conjecture in this matter, they could neither make an end themselves, nor fix any bounds unto the imagination of others. Having once lost its true author, no other could be asserted with any such evidence, or indeed probability, but that instantly twenty more, with as good grounds and reasons, might be entitled unto it. Accordingly, sundry persons have been *named*, all upon the same account,—that some thought good to name them; and why should not one man's authority, in this matter, be as good as another's?

4. Origen, in Eusebius,[1] affirms that some supposed LUKE to have been the author of this Epistle; but neither doth he approve their opinion, nor mention what reasons they pretend for it. He adds also, that some esteemed it to be written by Clemens of Rome.[2] Clemens of Alexandria allows St Paul to be the author of it; but supposeth it might be translated by Luke, because, as he saith, the *style* of it is not unlike that of his in the Acts of the Apostles. Grotius of late contends for Luke to be the author of it on the same account;[3] but the instances which he gives rather argue a *coincidence* of some words and phrases than a *similitude* of style, which things are very different. Jerome also tells us that "juxta quosdam videtur esse Lucæ evangelistæ,"—"by some it was thought to be written by Luke the evangelist;"[4] which he took from Clemens, Origen, and Eusebius; only he mentions nothing of the similitude of style with that of St Luke, but afterwards informs us that, in his judgment, there is a great conformity in style between this Epistle and that of Clemens Romanus. None of them acquaint us who were the authors or approvers of this conjecture, nor do they give any credit themselves unto it; neither is there any reason of this opinion reported by them, but only that intimated by Clemens,[5] of the agreement of the style with that of the Acts of the Apostles (which yet is not allowed by Jerome); whereon he doth not ascribe the *writing*, but only the *translation* of it, unto Luke. Grotius alone contends for him to be the author of it, and that with this only argument, that sundry words are used in the same sense by St Luke and the writer of this Epistle; but that this observation is of no moment shall afterwards be declared.

This opinion, then, may be well rejected as a groundless *guess*, of an obscure, unknown original, and not *tolerably* confirmed either by

[1] Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxv. [2] Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xiii. [3] Grot. Præf. in Annot. ad Epist. ad Heb. [4] Hieron. Scrip. Eccles. in Paul. [5] Scrip. Eccles. in Clement.

testimony or circumstances of things. If we will forego a persuasion established on so many important considerations, as we shall manifest this of St Paul's being the author of this Epistle to be, and confirmed by so many testimonies, upon every arbitrary, ungrounded *conjecture*, we may be sure never to find rest in any thing that we are rightly persuaded of. But I shall add one consideration, that will cast this opinion of Grotius quite out of the limits of probability. By general consent, this Epistle was written whilst James was yet alive, and *presided* in the church of the Hebrews at Jerusalem; and I shall afterwards prove it so to have been. What was his authority as an apostle, what his reputation in that church, is both known in general from the nature of his *office*, and in particular is intimated in the Scripture, Acts xii. 17, xv. 13; Gal. ii. 9. These were the Hebrews whose instruction in this Epistle is principally intended; and by their means that of their brethren in the *eastern dispersion* of them. Now, is it reason to imagine that any one who was not an apostle, but only a scholar and follower of them, should be used to write unto that church, wherein so great an apostle, a "pillar" among them, had his especial residence, and did actually preside; and that, in an argument of such huge importance, with reasons against a *practice* wherein they were all engaged, yea, that apostle himself, as appears, Gal. ii. 12? Were any one then alive of more *esteem* and reputation in the church than others, certainly *he* was the fittest to be used in this employment; and how well all things of this nature agree unto St Paul, we shall see afterwards.

5. Some have assigned the writing of this Epistle unto BARNABAS. Clemens, Origen, Eusebius, make no mention of him. Tertullian[1] was the author of this opinion, and it is reported as his by Jerome.[2] Philastrius[3] also remembers the report of it. And it is of late defended by Cameron[4] (as the former concerning Luke by Grotius); whose reasons for his conjecture are confuted with some sharpness by Spanheim,[5] mindful, as it seems, of his father's controversy with some of his scholars. The authority of Tertullian is the sole foundation of this opinion; but as the book wherein he mentions it was written in his paroxysm, when he uttered not that only *unadvisedly*, so he seems not to lay much weight on the Epistle itself, only preferring it unto the apocryphal Hermes: "Receptior," saith he, "apud ecclesias epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho Pastore Mœchorum." And we have showed that the Latin church was, for a time, somewhat unacquainted with this Epistle, so that it is no marvel if one of them should mistake its author. Grotius[6] would disprove this opinion from the *dissimilitude* of its style, and that

[1] Tertul. de Pudicit. cap. xx. [2] Hieron. Cat Scrip. in Paul. et Barnab. [3] Philastr. Hær. 41. [4] Camero Quæ. in Epist. ad Heb. [5] Spanh. de Auth. Epist. ad Heb. [6] Grot. Præf. Annot. in Epist. ad Heb.

which goes under the name of Barnabas, which is corrupt and barbarous. But there is little weight in that observation, that epistle being certainly *spurious*, no way savouring the wisdom or spirit of him on whom it hath been vulgarly imposed. But yet, that it was that epistle which is cited by some of the ancients under the name of Barnabas, and not this unto the Hebrews, is well proved by Baronius,[1] from the names that Jerome[2] mentions out of that epistle, which are nowhere to be found in this to the Hebrews. But that epistle of Barnabas is an open fruit of that vanity, which prevailed in many about the third and fourth ages of the church, of *personating* in their writings some apostolical persons; wherein they seldom or never kept any good decorum, as might easily be manifested in this particular instance. As to our present case, the reason before mentioned is of the same validity against this as [against] the other opinion concerning Luke; whereunto others of an equal evidence may be added. Barnabas was not an apostle, properly and strictly so called, nor had apostolical mission or authority; but rather seems to have been one of the seventy disciples, as Epiphanius affirms.[3] And Eusebius, a person less credulous than he, acknowledging that a just and true catalogue of them could not be given, yet placeth Barnabas as the first of them concerning whom all agreed.[4] Much weight, indeed, I shall not lay hereon, seeing it is evident that the catalogues, given us by the ancients of those disciples, are nothing but a *rude collection* of such names as they found in the books of the New Testament, applied without reason or testimony. But apostle he was none.

Many *circumstances* also concur to the removal of this conjecture. The Epistle was written in Italy, chap. xiii. 24, where it doth not appear that Barnabas ever was. The fabulous author, I confess, of the rhapsody called "The Recognitions of Clemens," tells us that Barnabas went to Rome, taking Clemens along with him; and, returning into Judea, found St Peter at Cæsarea. But St Luke in the Acts gives us another account, both where Barnabas was and how he was employed, at the time intimated by him who knew nothing of those things; for whilst St Peter was at Cæsarea, Acts x. 1, etc., Barnabas was at Jerusalem, Acts ix. 26, 27, being a little while after sent to Antioch by the apostles, chap. xi. 22. Again, Timothy was the companion of the writer of this Epistle, Heb. xiii. 23; a person, as far as appears, unknown unto Barnabas, being taken into St Paul's society after their difference and separation, Acts xv. 37–39, xvi. 1–3. He had also been in bonds or imprisonment, Heb. x. 34, whereof we cannot at that time learn any thing concerning Barnabas, those of St Paul being known unto all. And, lastly, not long before the writing

[1] Baron. Ann. Eccles. an. 51, n. 55. [2] Hieron. de Nomin. Heb. [3] Epiphan. Hær. lib. i. cap. x. [4] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. xiii.

of this Epistle, Barnabas was so far from that light into, and apprehension of the nature, use, and expiration of Judaical rites herein expressed, that he was easily misled into a *practical* miscarriage in the observation of them, Gal. ii. 13; wherein although some (after Jerome's fancy, that the difference between St Peter and St Paul was only in pretence[1]) have laboured to free St Peter and his companions on other grounds from any sinful failing,—as it should seem in a direct opposition unto the testimony of St Paul, affirming that κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, in that particular "he was to be blamed" or condemned, ver. 11, not unlike him who hath written a justification of Aaron in his making the golden calf,[2]—yet that Barnabas was not come up unto any constancy in his practice about Mosaical institutions is evident from the text. And shall we suppose that he who but a little before, upon the coming of some few brethren of the church of Jerusalem from St James, durst not avouch and abide by his own personal liberty, but deserted the use of it, not without some blamable dissimulation, ver. 13, should now, with so much authority, write an Epistle unto that church with St James, and all the Hebrews in the world, concurring with them in judgment and practice about that very thing wherein himself, out of respect unto them, had particularly miscarried? This certainly was rather the work of St Paul, whose light and constancy in the doctrine delivered in this Epistle, with his engagement in the defence of it above all the rest of the apostles, are known from the story of the Acts and his own other writings.

6. Apollos hath been thought by some to be the penman of this Epistle, and that because it answers the *character* given of him;[3] for it is said that he was "an eloquent man, mighty in the Scriptures," fervent in spirit, and one that "mightily convinced the Jews" out of the Scripture itself, Acts xviii. 24, 28,—all which things appear throughout this whole discourse. But this conjecture hath no countenance from antiquity, no mention being made of any epistle written by Apollos, or of any thing else; so that he is not reckoned by Jerome amongst the ecclesiastical writers, nor by those who interpolated that work with some fragments out of Sophronius. Nor is he reported, by Clemens, Origen, or Eusebius, to have been by any esteemed the author of this Epistle. However, I confess somewhat of moment might have been apprehended in the observation mentioned, if the excellencies ascribed unto Apollos had been peculiar unto him; yea, had they not all of them been found in St Paul, and that in a manner and degree more eminent than in the other. But this being so, the ground of this conjecture is taken from under it.

7. Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, in the places forecited, mention

[1] Hieron. Epist. ad August. et Com. in cap. ii. Epist. ad Gal.; Baron. Ann. Eccles. an. 65, n. 39–41. [2] Monceius de Vitul. Aur. [3] Luther on Gen. xlviii. 10.

a report concerning some who ascribed this Epistle unto CLEMENS ROMANUS. None of them give any countenance unto it, or intimate any grounds of that supposition; only Jerome affirms that there is some similitude between the style of this Epistle and that of Clemens, which occasioned the suspicion of his translating it; whereof afterwards. Erasmus hath since taken up that report, and seems to give credit unto it; but hath not contributed any thing of reason or testimony unto its confirmation.[1] A worthy, holy man was this Clemens, no doubt, and bishop of the church at Rome. But none of the ancients of any learning or judgment ever laid weight on this conjecture. For what had he, who was a convert from among the Gentiles, to do with the churches of the Hebrews? what authority had he to *interpose* himself in that which was their peculiar concernment? Whence may it appear that he had that skill in the nature, use, and end of Mosaical rites and institutions, which the writer of this Epistle discovers in himself? Neither doth that epistle of his to the church of Corinth, which is yet extant, though excellent in its kind, permit us to think that he wrote by divine inspiration. Besides, the author of this Epistle had a desire and purpose to go to the Hebrews; yea, he desires to be "restored" unto them, as one that had been with them before, chap. xiii. 19, 23. But as it doth not appear that this Clemens was ever in Palestine, so what reason he should have to leave his own charge now to go thither, no man can imagine. And to end this needless debate, in that epistle which was truly his own, he makes use of the words and authority of this, as Eusebius long since observed.

8. Sixtus Senensis affirms that the work whose author we inquire after was by some assigned unto TERTULLIAN.[2] A fond and impious imagination, and such as no man of judgment or sobriety could ever fall into! This Epistle was famous in the churches before Tertullian was born; is ascribed by himself unto Barnabas; and some passages in it are said by him to be corrupted by one Theodotus long before his time.[3]

From the uncertainty of these conjectures, with the evidence of reason and circumstances whereby they are disproved, two things we seem to have obtained;—first, That no objection on their account can arise against our assertion; and, secondly, That if St Paul be not acknowledged to be the writer of this Epistle, the whole church of God is, and ever was, at a total loss whom to ascribe it unto. And it may reasonably be expected that the weakness of these conjectures should, if not add unto, yet set off the credibility of the reasons and testimonies which shall be produced in the assignment of it unto him.

[1] Eras. Annot. in cap. xiii. [2] Sixtus Senen. Biblioth. lib. vii. cap. viii. [3] Tertul. Præf. ad Hær.

9. The *objections* that are laid by some against our assignation of this Epistle unto St Paul, according unto the order proposed, are nextly to be considered. These I shall pass through with what briefness I can, so as not to be wanting unto the defensative designed.

First, *Dissimilitude of style*, and manner of writing, from that used by St Paul in his other epistles, is pressed in the first place, and principally insisted on; and indeed it is the whole of what, with any colour of reason, is made use of in this cause. This the ancients admitted. The *elegance, propriety of speech*, and sometimes *loftiness*, that occur in this Epistle, difference it, as they say, from those of St Paul's writing. Δοκεῖ μὲν οὐκ εἶναι Παύλου διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα, saith Œcumenius;—"It seems not to be St Paul's, because of the style or character of speech."[1] For this cause Clemens of Alexandria supposed it to be written in Hebrew, and to be translated into Greek by St Luke the evangelist; the style of it, as he says, being like unto that which is used in the Acts of the Apostles;[2] and yet that is acknowledged by all to be purely Greek, whereas this is accused to be full of Hebraisms! So little weight is to be laid on these critical censures, wherein learned men perpetually contradict one another.

Origen also confesseth that it hath not in its character τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐν λόγῳ, the "idiotism," or propriety of the language of St Paul, who acknowledgeth himself to be ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, 2 Cor. xi. 6, "rude in speech:" and this Epistle is, saith he, ἐν συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικοτέρα, "in the composition of its speech elegantly Greek," in comparison of his; which, if we may believe him, any one will discern who can judge between the difference of styles.[3] And Jerome: "Scripserat autem ad Hebræos Hebraice, id est suo eloquio dissertissime; ut ea quæ eloquenter scripta fuerant in Hebræo eloquentius verterentur in Græcum; et hanc causam esse quod a cæteris Pauli epistolis discrepare videatur;"—"It seems to differ from the rest of St Paul's epistles because of its translation out of Hebrew;"[4] wherein he speaks not with his wonted confidence. And elsewhere he says that the *style* of this Epistle seems to be like that of Clemens. Erasmus presseth this objection. "Restat," saith he, "jam argumentum illud quo non aliud certius, stylus ipse et orationis character, qui nihil habet affinitatis cum phrasi Paulina;"—"The style and character of speech have no affinity with the phrase of St Paul."[5] This consideration also drew Calvin into the same opinion; and it is insisted on by Cameron and Grotius to the same purpose. The sum of this objection is, that St Paul was "rude in speech," which is manifest in his other epistles; but the style of this is pure, elegant, florid, such as hath no affinity with his: so that he cannot be esteemed the penman of it.

[1] Œcumen. Præf. in Epist. ad Heb. [2] Clemens in Hypotyp. [3] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxv [4] Hieron. Cat. Scrip. in Paul. [5] Eras. Annot. in cap. xiii. 24.

10. As this objection was taken notice of by them of old, and the matter of it admitted as true, so because they constantly adhered to the assignation of it unto St Paul, they gave sundry answers unto it. Origen gives us his judgment, that the sense and subject-matter of this Epistle were from St Paul, which are excellent, and no way inferior to those of the same apostle in any other epistles, as every one exercised in the reading of his epistles will grant; but the structure and phrase of it he supposeth to have been the work of some other, who, taking the dictates of his master, from thence composed this Epistle. But this answer can by no means be admitted of, nor accommodated unto any writing given by divine inspiration: for not only the *matter* but the very *words* of their writings were suggested unto his penmen by the Holy Ghost (that the whole might have no influence from human frailty or fallibility); which alone renders the authority of their writings sacred and divine. But this intimation would resolve the truth in this Epistle into the care and diligence of him that took the sense of St Paul, and thence composed it; wherein he was liable to mistakes, unless we shall vainly suppose that he also was inspired. Wherefore they who admitted of this objection generally gave the answer unto it before intimated, namely, that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew by St Paul, and translated by some other into the Greek language. So Œcumenius: Τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἠλλάχθαι τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς φανερὰ ἡ αἰτία· πρὸς γὰρ Ἑβραίους τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ γραφεῖσα ὕστερον μεθερμηνευθῆναι λέγεται·—"The cause of the alteration or difference of style in this Epistle is manifest; for it is said to be written unto the Hebrews in their own language, and to be afterwards translated." Jerome and Clemens also incline to this opinion and answer: and Theophylact, though, following Theodoret,[1] he egregiously confutes them who deny St Paul to be the author of this Epistle, from the excellency, efficacy, and irrefragable power and authority wherewith it is accompanied, yet admits of this objection, and answers, with others, that it was translated by St Luke or Clemens. Only Chrysostom,[2] who indeed is πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων, without taking notice of the pretended dissimilitude of style, ascribes it directly to St Paul. But to this answer incline generally the divines of the Roman church, as Catharinus,[3] Bellarminus,[4] Baronius,[5] Cornelius a Lapide,[6] Canus,[7] Mattheus Galenus,[8] Ludovicus Tena,[9] and others without number; though it be rejected by Estius,[10] and some others among themselves. What is to be thought of it, we shall afterwards consider in a dissertation designed unto that purpose. For the present, we affirm that it is no way needful as an

[1] Theodor. Argu. in Epist. ad Heb. [2] Chrysost. Præf. in Epist. ad Heb. [3] Cathar. de Auth. Epist. ad Heb. Diss. [4] Bellar. de Verb. Dei. lib. i. cap. xvii. [5] Baron. Ann. Eccles. an. 51, n. 55. [6] A Lapid. Præf. in Epist. [7] Can. loc. Com. lib. ii. cap. xi. [8] Galenus Præf. in Epist. ad Heb. [9] Ten. Prælud. iv. [10] Estius Prolegom.

answer unto the objection insisted on, as we shall now further particularly manifest.

11. The foundation of this objection lies in St Paul's acknowledgment that he was ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ,—"rude in speech," 2 Cor. xi. 6. This Origen presseth, and Jerome takes occasion hence to censure his skill in his mother tongue; for so was the Greek unto them that were born at Tarsus in Cilicia, and this was the place of St Paul's nativity: though the same Jerome, from I know not what tradition, affirms that he was born at Giscalis, a town of Galilee, from whence he went afterwards with his parents to Tarsus; contrary to his own express testimony, Acts xxii. 3, "I verily was born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia."

But this seems an infirm foundation for the objection insisted on. Paul in that place is dealing with the Corinthians about the false teachers who seduced them from the simplicity of the gospel. The course which they took to ensnare them was vain, affected eloquence, and strains of rhetoric unbecoming the work they pretended to be engaged in. Puffed up with this singularity, they contemned St Paul as a rude, unskilful person, no way able to match them in their fine declamations. In answer hereunto, he first tells them that it became not him to use σοφίαν λόγου, 1 Cor. i. 17,—that "wisdom of words," or speech, which orators flourished withal; or διδάκτους ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγους, chap. ii. 13,—"the words that man's wisdom teacheth," or an artificial composition of words, to entice thereby, which he calls ὑπεροχὴν λόγου, chap. ii. 1. And many reasons he gives why it became him not to make use of those things, so as to make them his design, as the seducers and false apostles did. Again, he answers by concession in this place, Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, —"Suppose I be (or were) rude or unskilful in speech, doth this matter depend thereon? Is it not manifest unto you that I am not so in the knowledge of the mystery of the gospel?" "He doth not confess that he is so," saith Austin, "but grants it for their conviction." And in this sense concur Œcumenius, Aquinas, Lyra, Catharinus, Clarius, and Cappellus, with many others on the place. If, then, by λόγος here, that seducing, enticing rhetoric wherewith the false teachers entangled the affections of their unskilful hearers be intended, as we grant that St Paul, it may be, was unskilful in it, and are sure that he would make no use of it, so it is denied that any footsteps of it appear in this Epistle; and if any thing of solid, convincing, unpainted eloquence be intended in it, it is evident that St Paul neither did nor justly could confess himself unacquainted with it; only he made a concession of the objection made against him by the false teachers, to manifest how they could obtain no manner of advantage thereby.

12. Neither are the other epistles of St Paul written in so low

and homely a style as is pretended. Chrysostom, speaking of him, tells us, Ὑπὲρ τὸν ἥλιον ἔλαμψεν ἡ τούτου γλῶττα, and that for his eloquence he was esteemed Mercury by the Gentiles.[1] Somewhat hath been spoken hereunto before, whereunto I shall now only add the words of a person who was no incompetent judge in things of this nature. "Quum," saith he, "orationis ipsius totam indolem et χαρακτῆρα propius considero, nullam ego in ipso Platone similem grandiloquentiam, quoties illi libuit Dei mysteria detonare; nullam in Demosthene parem δεινότητα comperisse me fateor, quoties animos vel metu divini judicii perterrefacere, vel commonefacere, vel ad contemplandam Dei bonitatem attrahere, vel ad pietatis ac misericordiæ officia constituit adhortari: nullam denique vel in ipso Aristotele et Galeno, præstantissimis alioquin artificibus, magis exactam docendi methodum invenio;"—"When I well consider the genius and character of the speech and style of this apostle, I confess I never found that grandeur in Plato himself as in him, when he thundereth out the mysteries of God; nor that gravity and vehemency in Demosthenes as in him, when he intends to terrify the minds of men with a dread of the judgments of God, or would warn them or draw them to the contemplation of his goodness, or the performance of the duties of piety and mercy; nor do I find a more exact method of teaching in those great and excellent masters, Aristotle and Galen, than in him."[2] So it is plainly; so the Greek fathers almost with one consent do testify; so do most of the Latins also; so the best learned of the later critics; and so may it be defended against any opposition. And Jerome himself, who takes most liberty to censure his style, doth so far in other places forget his own temerity therein as to cry out against those who "dreamed," as he speaks, that St Paul was not thoroughly acquainted with all propriety of speech. And he who was the first that ever spake a word about any defect of this kind, though as able to judge as any one whatever who hath since passed his censure unto the same purpose, was in an evident mistake in the very instance which he pitched on to confirm his observation. This was Irenæus, one of the first and most learned of the Greek fathers: for, affirming that there are many hyperbata in the style of this apostle, which render it uneven and difficult, he confirms his assertion with an instance in 2 Cor. iv. 4, "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not;" for saith he, "The words should naturally have been thus placed, 'In whom God hath blinded the minds of them that in this world believe not.'" So, to obviate a foolish sophism in the Valentinians, a hyperbaton must be supposed in the apostle's style, when indeed there is not the least colour of it. Upon the whole matter, then, I shall confidently assert, that there is no manner of defect in

[1] Chrysost. Proœm. in Epist. ad. Rom. [2] Beza Annot. in 2 Cor. xi. 6.

any of his writings, and that every thing (considering the matter and nature of it, the Person in whose name he spake, and those to whom he wrote) is expressed as it ought to be for the end proposed, and not otherwise. And hence it is that, because of the variety of the subject-matter treated of, and difference among the persons to whom he wrote, there is also variety in his way and manner of expressing himself in sundry of his epistles; and in many of them there is such a discovery and manifestation of solid eloquence and pure elegancy of speech, that the observation of them in any writing is far from having any weight to prove it none of his.

13. It may, then, be *granted*, though it be not *proved*, that there is some dissimilitude of style between this and the rest of the epistles of St Paul; and the reasons of it are sufficiently manifest. The argument treated of in this Epistle is diverse from that of most of the others; many circumstances in those to whom he wrote singular; the spring of his reasonings and way of his arguings peculiarly suited unto his subject-matter and the condition of those unto whom he wrote. Besides, in the writing of this Epistle there was in him an especial frame and incitation of spirit, occasioned by many occurrences relating unto it. His intense love and near relation in the flesh unto them to whom he wrote, affectionately remembered by himself, and expressed in a manner inimitable, Rom. ix. 1–3, did doubtless exert itself in his treating about their greatest and nearest concernment. The prejudices and enmity of some of them against him, recorded in several places of the Acts, and remembered by himself in some other of his epistles, lay also under his consideration. Much of the subject that he treated about was matter of controversy, which was to be debated from the Scripture, and wherein those with whom he dealt thought they might dissent from him without any prejudice to their faith or obedience. Their condition also must needs greatly affect him. They were now not only under present troubles, dangers, and fears, but "positi inter sacrum et saxum," at the very door of ruin, if not delivered from the snare of obstinate adherence unto Mosaical institutions. Now, they who know not what alterations in style and manner of writing these things will produce, in those who have an ability to express the conceptions of their minds and the affections wherewith they are attended, know nothing of this matter. And other differences from the rest of Paul's epistles, but what may evidently be seen to arise from these and the like causes, none have yet discovered, nor can so do. And notwithstanding the *elegancy of the style* pretended, that it is as full of Hebraisms as any other epistle of the same author, we shall discover in our passage through it; which certainly a person of that ability in the Greek tongue as the writer of this Epistle discovers himself to be might have avoided, if he had thought meet so to do.

14. Neither is it to be omitted that there is such a coincidence in many *phrases*, use of words and expressions, between this Epistle and the rest of St Paul's, as will not allow us to grant such a *discrepancy in style* as some imagine. They have many of them been gathered by others, and therefore I shall only point unto the places from whence they are taken. See chap. i. 1, 2, compared with 2 Cor. xiii. 3. Chap. ii. 14, with Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12. Chap. ii. 11, with Eph. v. 26. Chap. iii. 1, with Phil. iii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 9. Chap. iii. 6, with Rom. v. 2. Chap. v. 14, with 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. iii. 15; Eph. iv. 13. Chap. v. 13, with 1 Cor. iii. 2. Chap. vi. 11, with Col. ii. 2; 1 Thess. i. 5. Chap. vii. 18, with Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9. Chap. viii. 6, 7, with Gal. iii. 19, 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5. Chap. x. 1, with Col. ii. 17. Chap. x. 22, with 2 Cor. vii. 1. Chap. x. 23, a phrase peculiar to St Paul, and common with him. Chap. x. 33, with 1 Cor. iv. 9. Chap. x. 36, with Gal. iii. 22. Chap. x. 39, with 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13. Chap. xii. 1, with 1 Cor. ix. 24. Chap. xiii. 10, with 1 Cor. ix. 13, x. 18. Chap. xiii. 15, 16, with Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18. Chap. xiii. 20, with Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23. Many of which places having before been observed by others, they are all of them collected in this order by Spanheim; and many more of the like nature might be added unto them, but that these are sufficient to outbalance the contrary instances of *some words and expressions* nowhere else used by St Paul, which perhaps may be observed of every other epistle in like manner. And upon all these considerations it appears how little force there is in this objection.

15. Secondly, It is excepted that the Epistle is ἀνεπίγραφος, the name of Paul being not prefixed unto it, as it is, say some, unto all the epistles written by him. And this, indeed, is the womb wherein all other objections have been conceived; for this being once taken notice of, and admitted as an *objection*, the rest were but fruits of men's needless diligence to give countenance unto it. And this exception is ancient, and that which alone some of old took any notice of; for it is considered by Clemens, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and generally by all that have spoken any thing about the writer of this Epistle. Nor doth the strength that it hath lie merely in this, that it is *without inscription*, for so is the Epistle of St John, concerning which it was never doubted but that he was the author of it, but in the constant usage of Paul, prefixing his name unto all his other epistles; so that unless a *just reason* can be given why he should divert from that custom in the writing of this, it may be well supposed to be none of his.

Now, by the *title* which is wanting, either the mere *titular superscription*, "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews," is in-

tended, or the *inscription of his name*, with an *apostolical salutation* conjoined, in the Epistle itself. For the first, it is uncertain of what antiquity the titular superscriptions of any of the epistles are, but most certain that they did not *originally* belong unto them, and are therefore destitute of all authority. They are things the *transcribers*, it may be, have at pleasure made bold withal, as with the *subscription* also of some of them, as to the place from whence they were sent, and the persons by whom. Though this, therefore, should be wanting unto this Epistle, as there is some variety both in *ancient copies* of the *original* and *translations* about it, the most owning and retaining it, yet it would be of no moment, seeing we know not whence or from whom any of them are. The objection, then, is taken from the want of the wonted *apostolical salutation*, which should be in and a part of the Epistle. And this is the substance of what on this account is excepted against our assertion.

16. Various answers have been given to this objection, some of them of no more validity than itself. Jerome replies, "It hath no man's name prefixed; therefore we may by as good reason say, it was *written by no man, as not by Paul;*"—which instance, though it be approved by Beza, with other learned men, and not sufficiently answered by Erasmus with a contrary instance, yet indeed it is of no value; for *being written*, it must be written by *somebody*, though not perhaps by St Paul. Some have thought that it may be the inscription inquired after was at first prefixed, but by some means or other hath been *lost*. But as there are very many arguments and evidences to evince the weakness of this imagination, so the beginning and entrance of the Epistle is such as is incapable of any contexture with such a *salutation* as that used in other Epistles, as is also that of St John; so that this conjecture can here have no place.

17. Some of the ancients, and principally Theodoret, insist upon the peculiar allotment of his work unto him among the Gentiles. Paul was the apostle of the Gentiles in an especial manner; and if, in writing unto the Hebrews, he had prefixed his name unto his Epistle, he might have seemed to transgress the *line of his allotment*. And if it be not certain that the apostles, by common consent, cast their work into distinct portions, which they peculiarly attended unto, as the ancients generally concur that they did (and there was not reason wanting why they should do so), yet it is [certain] that there was a special convention and agreement between James, Peter, and John, on the one side, and Paul and Barnabas on the other, that they should attend the ministry of the *Circumcision*, and these of the *Gentiles*. Hence Paul, finding it necessary for him to write unto the Hebrews, would not prefix his name with an *apostolical*

salutation unto his Epistle, that he might not seem to have invaded the province of others, or transgressed the line of his allotment. But I must acknowledge, that, notwithstanding the weight laid upon it by Theodoret and some others, this reason seems not unto me cogent unto the end for which it is produced: for,—(1.) The *commission* given by the Lord Christ unto his apostles was *catholic*, and had no bounds but that of the *whole creation of God* capable of instruction, Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; and that commission which was given unto them all in general was given unto every one in *particular*, and made him *in solidum* possessor of all the right and authority conveyed by it. Neither could any following *arbitrary* agreement, pitched on for convenience and the facilitating of their work, abridge any of them from exerting their *authority* and exercising their *duty* towards any of the sons of men, as occasion did require. And hence it is, that notwithstanding the agreement mentioned, we find St Peter teaching the Gentiles, and St Paul labouring for the conversion of the Jews. (2.) In writing this Epistle, on this supposition, St Paul did indeed that which is pretended was not meet for him to do,—namely, he entered on that which was the charge of another man; only he *conceals his name*, that he might not appear in doing of a thing unwarrantable and unjustifiable! And whether it be meet to ascribe this unto the apostle is easy to determine. As, then, it is certain that St Paul, in the writing of this Epistle, did nothing but what in *duty* he ought to do, and what the authority given him by Christ extended itself unto; so the *concealing of his name*, lest he should be thought to have done any thing irregularly, is a thing that, without much temerity, may not be imputed unto him.

18. There is another answer to this objection, which *seemeth* to be *solid* and satisfactory, which most of the ancients rest in; and it is, that St Paul had weighty reasons not to declare his name at the entrance of this Epistle to the Hebrews, taken from the *prejudices* that many of them had against him. This is insisted on by Clemens in Eusebius. "He did wisely," saith he, "conceal his name, because of the prejudicate opinion that they had against him."[1] And this is at large insisted on by Chrysostom,[2] who is followed therein by Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others without number. The *persecuting* party of the nation looked on him as an *apostate*, a *deserter* of the cause wherein he was once engaged, and one that taught *apostasy* from the law of Moses; yea, as they thought, that set the whole world against them and all that they *gloried in*, Acts xxi. 28; and what enmity is usually stirred up on such occasions all men know, and his example is a sufficient instance of it. And there was added thereunto (which Chrysostom,

[1] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. cap. xiii. [2] Proœm. in Epist. ad Heb.

and that justly, lays great weight upon), that he was no *ordinary person,* but a man of great and *extraordinary* abilities; which mightily increased the provocation. Those among them who, with the profession of the gospel, had a mind to continue themselves in, and to impose upon others the observance of, Mosaical institutions, looked on him as the only person that had frustrated their design, Acts xv. 1, 2. And this also is usually no small cause of wrath and hatred. The spirit of these men afterwards possessing the Ebionites, they despised St Paul as a Grecian and deserter of the law, as Epiphanius testifies. And even the best among them, who, either in the use of their liberty or upon an indulgence given them, continued in the *temple worship,* had a jealous eye over him, lest he had not that esteem for Moses which they imagined became them to retain, Acts xxi. 20, 21. How great a prejudice against his doctrine and reasonings these thoughts and jealousies might have created, had he, at the *entrance* of his dealing with them, prefixed his *name and usual salutation,* is not hard to conjecture. This being the state and condition of things in reference unto St Paul, and not any other known penman of the Holy Ghost, or eminent disciple of Christ in those days, this *defect* of *inscription,* as Beza well observes, proves the Epistle rather to be his than any other person's whatever. And though I know that there may be some reply made unto this answer, both from the discovery which he makes of himself in the end of the Epistle, and from the high probability there is that the Hebrews, upon the first receipt of it, would diligently examine by whom it was written, yet I judge it very *sufficient* to frustrate the exception insisted on, though perhaps not containing the *true,* at least the *whole,* cause of the omission of an *apostolical salutation* in the entrance of it.

19. If, then, we would know *the true and just cause of the omission of the author's name and mention of his apostolical authority* in the entrance of this Epistle, we must consider *what were the just reasons of prefixing them* unto his other epistles. Chrysostom, in his proem unto the Epistle to the Romans, gives this as the only reason of the mentioning the name of the writer of any epistle in the frontispiece of it otherwise than was done by Moses and the evangelists in their writings, namely, because they wrote unto them that were *present,* and so had no cause to make mention of their own names, which were well enough known without the premising of them in their writings; whereas those who wrote epistles, dealing with them that were *absent,* were necessitated to prefix their names unto them, that they might know from whom they came. But yet this reason is not absolutely satisfactory: for as they who prefixed not their names to their writings wrote, not only for the use and benefit of those that were present and knew them, but of all succeeding ages,

who knew them not; so many of them who yet prefixed their names unto their writings, did preach and write the word of the Lord unto those that lived with them and knew them, as did the prophets of old; and some who did write epistles to them who were absent omitted so to do, as St John and the author of this Epistle. The real cause, then, of prefixing the names of any of the apostles unto their writings, was merely the *introduction thereby of their titles as apostles of Jesus Christ*, and therein an intimation of that authority by and with which they wrote. This, then, was the true and only reason why the apostle St Paul prefixed his name unto his epistles. Sometimes, indeed, this is omitted, when he wrote unto some churches where he was well known, and his apostolical power was sufficiently owned, because he joined others with himself in his salutation who were not apostles; as the Epistle to the Philippians, chap. i., and the second of the Thessalonians. Unto all others he still prefixeth this title; declaring himself thereby to be one so authorized to reveal the mysteries of the gospel, that they to whom he wrote were to acquiesce in his authority, and to resolve their faith into the revelation of the will of God made unto him and by him, the church being to be "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets." And hence it was, that when something he had taught was called in question and opposed, writing in the vindication of it, and for their establishment in the truth whom before he had instructed, he doth in the *entrance* of his writing singularly and emphatically mention this his authority: Gal. i. 1, "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, that raised him from the dead;" so intimating the absolute obedience that was due unto the doctrine by him revealed. By this title, I say, he directs them to whom he wrote to resolve their assent into the authority of Christ speaking in him, which he tenders unto them as the proof and foundation of the mysteries wherein they were instructed.

In his dealing with the Hebrews the case was far otherwise. They who believed, amongst them, never changed the old foundation, or church-state grounded on the Scriptures, though they had a new addition of privileges by their faith in Christ Jesus, as the Messiah now exhibited. And therefore he deals not with them as with those whose faith was built absolutely on apostolical authority and revelation, but upon the common principles of the Old Testament, on which they still stood, and out of which evangelical faith was educed. Hence the beginning of the Epistle, wherein he appeals to the *Scripture* as the foundation that he intended to build upon, and the authority which he would press them withal, supplies the room of that intimation of his *apostolical authority* which in other places he maketh use of. And it serves to the very same purpose.

For, as in those epistles he proposeth his apostolical authority as the immediate reason of their assent and obedience; so in this he doth the scriptures of the Old Testament. And this is the *true* and *proper cause* that renders the prefixing of his apostolical authority, which must necessarily accompany his name, needless, because useless, it being that which he intended not to engage in this business. And for *himself*, he sufficiently declares in the close of his Epistle who he was; for though some may imagine that he is not so certainly known unto *us*, from what he there says of himself, yet none can be so fond as doubt whether he were not thereby known to *them* to whom he wrote. So that neither hath this objection in it any thing of real weight or moment.

20. Thirdly, We have spoken before unto the hesitation of the Latin church, which by some is objected, especially by Erasmus; and given the reasons of it, manifesting that it is of no force to weaken our assertion: unto which I shall now only add, that after it was received amongst them as canonical, it was never questioned by any learned man or synod of old whether St Paul was the author of it or no, but they all with one consent ascribed it unto him, as hath been at large by others declared. The remaining exceptions which by some are insisted on are taken from some passages in the Epistle itself; that principally of chap. ii. 3, where the writer of it seems to reckon himself among the number, not of the apostles, but of their *auditors* [*and survivors*]. But whereas it is certain and evident that the Epistle was written before the destruction of the temple, yea, [before] the beginning of those wars that ended therein, or the death of James, whilst sundry of the apostles were yet alive, it cannot be that the penman of it should really place himself amongst the generation that succeeded them; so that the words must of necessity admit of another interpretation, as shall be manifested in its proper place: for whereas both this and other things of the same nature must be considered and spoken unto in the places where they occur, I shall not here anticipate what of necessity must be insisted on in its due season, especially considering of how small importance the objections taken from them are.

And this is the sum of what hath, as yet, by any been objected unto our assignation of this Epistle unto St Paul; by the consideration whereof the reader will be directed into the judgment he is to make on the arguments and testimonies that we shall produce in the confirmation of our assertion; and these we now proceed unto, under the several heads proposed in the entrance of our discourse.

21. (1.) Amongst the arguments usually insisted on to prove this Epistle to have been written by St Paul, *the testimony given unto it by St Peter* deserves consideration in the first place, and is indeed

of itself sufficient to determine the inquiry about it. His words to this purpose, 2 Epist. iii. 15, 16, are: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according unto the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." To clear this testimony, some few things must be observed in it and concerning it; as,—(1.) That St Peter wrote this second epistle unto the same persons, that is, the same churches and people, to whom he wrote his first. This, to omit other evidences of it, himself testifies, chap. iii. 1: "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you." It was not only *absolutely* his second epistle, but the second which he wrote to the *same persons*, handling in both the same general argument, as himself in the next words affirms. (2.) That his first epistle was written unto the Jews or Hebrews in the Asian dispersion: Ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, etc.;—"To the elect strangers of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," chap. i. 1; that is, "The δώδεκα φυλὰς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ," as St James styles the same persons, chap. i. 1,—"The twelve tribes," or Hebrews of the twelve tribes of Israel, "in their dispersion." These παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς or ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, are those whom the Jews of Jerusalem called "The διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων," John vii. 35, "The dispersion," or those of their nation that were "dispersed among the Gentiles." Those especially they intend in the Greek empire. These they called תְּפוּצַת־יִשְׂרָאֵל, "The dispersion," or "scattering of Israel," when they were sifted amongst all nations, like the "sifting of a sieve," Amos ix. 9. Ps. cxlvii. 2, they are called נִדְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; which the LXX., according to the phrase in their days, render Τὰς διασπορὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, "The dispersions," or those scattered abroad of Israel; as Isaiah calls them, הָאֲבֻדִים בְּאֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר and הַנִּדָּחִים בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם, chap. xxvii. 13. So that there is no question but that these were they whom St Peter calls "The διασπορά of Pontus, Galatia," etc.; as St James, extending his salutation to the same people in all places, "The διασπορά of the twelve tribes." Besides, many things insisted on by St Peter in these epistles were peculiar to the Hebrews, who also were his especial care. See 1 Epist. i. 10–12, ii. 9, 21, iii. 5, 6, iv. 7, 17; 2 Epist. i. 19–21, ii. 1, etc., iii. 10–14; and many other particular places of the same nature may be observed in them.

To sum up our *evidence* in this particular: Peter, being in an especial manner the apostle of the Circumcision, or Hebrews, Gal. ii. 7, having by his first sermon converted many of these strangers of Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, Acts ii. 9–11, 41; ascribing that *title* unto them to whom he wrote which was the usual and proper

appellation of them in all the world, Ἡ διασπορὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, James i. 1, John vii. 35; treating with them for the most part about things *peculiar* to them in a special manner, and that with arguments and from principles peculiarly known unto them, as the places above quoted well manifest; there remains no *ground* of question but it was those Hebrews unto whom he wrote. Nor are the *exceptions* that are made to this evidence of any such importance as once to deserve a *remembrance* by them who design not a protracting of their discourses by insisting on things unnecessary.

22. Now, it is plainly in this *testimony* asserted, that St Paul wrote a peculiar epistle unto them unto whom St Peter wrote his; that is, to the Hebrews: "He hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles;" that is, in all his other epistles;"—'Besides his *other epistles* to other churches and persons, he hath also written one unto you.' So that, if St Peter's testimony may be received, St Paul undoubtedly wrote an epistle unto the Hebrews. "But this may be," say some, "*another epistle*, and not this we treat of; particularly that to the Galatians, which treateth about Judaical customs and worship." But this epistle mentioned by St Peter was written particularly unto the *Hebrews* in distinction from the *Gentiles;* this to the *Galatians* was written peculiarly to the *Gentiles* in opposition to the *Jews:* so that a more unhappy instance could not possibly have been fixed upon. Besides, he treats not in it of the things here mentioned by St Peter; which are indeed the main subject of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "But," say others, "Paul indeed might write an epistle to the Hebrews, which may be *lost*, and this that we have might be written by some other." But whence this answer should proceed, but from a resolution θέσιν διαφυλάττειν, against light and conviction, I know not. May we give place to such rash and presumptuous conjectures, we shall quickly have nothing left entire or stable; for why may not another as well say, 'It is true Moses wrote five books; but they are lost, and those that we have under his name were written by another'? It is not, surely, one jot less intolerable for any one, without ground, proof, or testimony, to affirm that the church hath lost an epistle written to the Hebrews by St Paul, and taken up one in the room thereof, written by, no man knoweth whom. This is not to deal with that *holy reverence* in the things of God which becomes us.

23. (2.) St Peter declares that St Paul, in that epistle which he wrote unto the Hebrews, had declared the "long-suffering of God," whereof he had minded them, to be "salvation." We must see what was this "long-suffering of God," how it was "salvation," and how Paul had manifested it so to be.

[1.] The *long-sufferance*, patience, or forbearance of God, is either *absolute*, toward man in general; or *special*, in reference unto some sort of men, or some kind of sins or provocations that are amongst

them. The first of these is not that which is here intended; nor was there any reason why St Peter should direct the Jews to the epistles of St Paul in particular to learn the *long-suffering of God in general*, which is so plentifully revealed in the whole scripture both of the Old and New Testament, and only *occasionally* at any time mentioned by St Paul. There was, therefore, an especial "long-suffering of God," which at that time he exercised towards the Jews, waiting for the conversion and the gathering of his *elect* unto him, before that total and final destruction which they had deserved should come upon that church and state. This he compares to the "long-suffering of God in the days of Noah," whilst he preached repentance unto the world, 1 Epist. iii. 20: for as those that were *obedient* unto his preaching (which was only his own family) were *saved in the ark* from the general destruction that came upon the world by *water;* so also they that became *obedient* upon the preaching of the gospel during this new season of God's special long-suffering were to be *saved by baptism*, or separation from the unbelieving Jews by the profession of the faith, from that destruction that was to come upon them by *fire*. This "long-suffering of God" the unbelieving Jews not understanding to be *particular*, scoffed at, and at them who threatened them with such an issue or event of it, 2 Epist. iii. 4; which causeth the apostle to declare the *nature* and *end* of this long-suffering, which they were ignorant of, verse 9.

[2.] And thus was this particular "long-suffering of God" towards the Jews, whilst the gospel was preached unto them before their final desolation, "salvation," in that God "spared" them, and allowed them to abide for a while in the observation of their *old worship* and *ceremonies*, granting them in the meantime blessed means of light and instruction, to bring them to salvation.

[3.] And this is declared by St Paul in this Epistle. Not that this is formally and in terms the main doctrine of the Epistle, but that really and effectually he acquaints them with the *intention* of the Lord in his long-suffering towards them; and peculiarly serves that long-suffering of Christ in his instruction of them. And therefore, after he hath taught them the true nature, use, and end of all Mosaical institutions, which they were as yet permitted to use, in the special patience of God intimated by St Peter, and convinced them of the necessity of faith in Christ and the profession of his gospel, he winds up all his *reasonings* in minding them of the *end* which shortly was to be put unto that "long-suffering of God" which was then exercised towards them, chap. xii. 25–29. So that this note also is eminently characteristical of this Epistle.

24. (3.) In the writing of the epistle mentioned by Peter, he seems to ascribe unto Paul an *eminency of wisdom;* it was written "according to the wisdom given unto him." As Paul in all other of his epistles

did exercise the grace of *wisdom*, so also in that which he wrote unto the Hebrews. There is no doubt but he exerted and put forth his other graces of *knowledge*, *zeal*, and *love* also; but yet Peter here, in a way of eminency, marketh his wisdom in that epistle. It is not Paul's spiritual wisdom in general, in the knowledge of the will of God and mysteries of the gospel, which Peter here refers unto, but that *special holy prudence* which he exercised in the composure of this epistle, and in maintaining the truth which he dealt with the Hebrews about. And what an eminent character this also is of this Epistle we shall endeavour, God assisting, to evince in our Exposition of it. His special *understanding* in all the *mysteries* of the Old Testament, that wrapped up the truth in great darkness and obscurity, *unfolding* things *hidden* from the foundation of the world; his *application* of them, with various *testimonies* and arguments, unto the mystery of "God manifested in the flesh;" his various intertextures of *reasonings* and *exhortations* throughout his Epistle; his *condescension* to the capacity, prejudices, and affections, of them to whom he wrote, urging them constantly with their *own principles* and *concessions*,—do, among many other things, manifest the *singular wisdom* which Peter signifies to have been used in this work.

(4.) It may also be observed, that whereas Peter affirms that among the things about which Paul wrote there were τινὰ δυσνόητα, "some things hard to be understood," Paul in a special manner confesseth that some of the things which he was to treat of in that Epistle were δυσερμήνευτα, "hard to be declared," uttered, or unfolded, and therefore certainly "hard to be understood," chap. v. 11; which in our progress we shall manifest to be spoken not without great and urgent *cause*, and that in *many instances*, especially that directed unto by himself concerning Melchizedek. So that this also gives another characteristical note of the epistle testified unto by Peter.

I have insisted the longer upon this testimony, because, in my judgment, it is sufficient of itself to determine this controversy; nothing of any importance being by any that I can meet withal excepted unto it. But because we want not other confirmations of our assertion, and those also every one of them singly outbalancing the conjectures that are advanced against it, we shall subjoin them also in their order.

25. The *comparing of this Epistle with the others of the same apostle* gives further evidence unto our assertion. I suppose it will be confessed, that they only are competent judges of this argument who are well exercised and *conversant* in his writings. Unto their judgment, therefore, alone in it do we appeal. Now, the *similitude* between this and other epistles of Paul is threefold:—(1.) In *words*, phrases, and manner of expression. Of this sort many instances may be given, and such a *coincidence of phrase* manifested

in them as is not usually to be observed between the writings that have various or diverse authors. But this I shall not particularly insist upon, partly because it hath already been done by others at large, and partly because they will all of them be observed in our Exposition itself; nor doth it suit our present design to enter into a debate about particular words and expressions. Nor do I assign any more force unto this observation, but only that it is sufficient to manifest the weakness of the exceptions urged by some to prove it none of his, from the use of some few words not elsewhere used by him, or not in that sense which here they are applied unto; for their instances are not in number comparable with the other. And to evidence the vanity of that part of their objection which concerns the peculiar use of some words in this Epistle, it is enough to observe that one word, ὑπόστασις, being three times used in this one Epistle, it hath in each place a peculiar and diverse signification. (2.) There is also a *coincidence of matter* or doctrines delivered in this and the other epistles of Paul. Neither shall I much press this consideration: for neither was he in any epistle restrained unto what he had elsewhere delivered, nor bound to avoid the mentioning of it if occasion did require; nor were other penmen of the Holy Ghost limited not to treat of what he had taught, no more than the evangelists were from writing the same story. But yet neither is this observation destitute of all efficacy to contribute strength unto our assertion, considering that there were some doctrines which Paul did in a peculiar manner insist upon; a vein whereof a diligent observer may find running through this and all his other epistles. But, (3.) That which under this head I would press, is the consideration of the *spirit, genius*, πάθος, and *manner of writing* proceeding from them, peculiar to this apostle in all his epistles. Many things are required to enable any one to judge aright of this intimation. He must, as Bernard speaks, drink of Paul's spirit, or be made partaker of the same Spirit with him, in his measure, who would understand his writings. Without this Spirit and his saving light, they are all obscure, intricate, sapless, unsavoury; while unto them in whom he is, they are all sweet, gracious, in some measure open, plain, and powerful. A great and constant *exercise* unto an acquaintance with his frame of spirit in writing is also necessary hereunto. Unless a man have contracted as it were a *familiarity*, by a constant conversation with him, no *critical* skill in words or phrases will render him a competent judge in this matter. This enabled Cæsar to determine aright concerning any writings of Cicero. And he that is so acquainted with this apostle will be able to discern his *spirit*, as Austin says his mother Monica did divine revelations, "nescio quo sapore,"—by an inexpressible spiritual savour. Experience also of the power and efficacy of his writings is hereunto

required. He whose heart is cast into the mould of the doctrine by him delivered will receive quick impressions, from his spirit exerting itself, in any of his writings. He that is thus prepared will find that *heavenliness* and perspicuity in unfolding the deepest evangelical mysteries; that peculiar *exaltation* of Jesus Christ, in his person, office, and work; that spiritual *persuasiveness;* that transcendent *manner* of arguing and reasoning; that wise *insinuation* and pathetical pressing of well-grounded exhortations; that *love*, tenderness, and affection to the souls of men; that *zeal for God* and *authority in teaching*, which enliven and adorn all his other epistles,—to shine in this in an eminent manner, from the beginning to the end of it. And this consideration, whatever may be the apprehensions of others concerning it, is that which gives me satisfaction, above all that are pleaded in this cause, in ascribing this Epistle to Paul.

26. The *testimony of the first churches*, of whose testimony any record is yet remaining, with a *successive suffrage of the most knowing persons of following ages*, may also be pleaded in this cause. Setting aside that *limitation* of this testimony, as to some in the Latin church, which, with the grounds and occasions of it, we have already granted and declared, this witness will be acknowledged to be catholic as to all other churches in the world. A learned man of late hath reckoned up and reported the words of above thirty of the Greek fathers and fifty of the Latin reporting this primitive tradition. I shall not trouble the reader with a catalogue of their names, nor the repetition of their words; and that because the whole of what in general we assert as to the eastern church is acknowledged. Amongst them was this Epistle first made *public*, as they had far more advantages of discovering the truth in this matter of fact than any in the Roman church, or that elsewhere followed them in after ages, could have. Neither had they any thing but the conviction and evidence of *truth* itself to induce them to embrace this persuasion. And he that shall consider the condition of the first churches under persecution, and what difficulties they met withal in *communicating* those apostolical writings which were delivered unto any of them, with that special obstruction unto the spreading of this unto the Hebrews of which we have already discoursed, cannot *rationally* otherwise conceive of it but as an eminent fruit of the good providence of God, that it should so soon receive so *public an attestation* from the first churches as it evidently appears to have done.

27. The *Epistle itself* several ways *discovers* its author. Some of them we shall briefly recount:—

(1.) The *general argument* and scope of it declares it to be Paul's. Hereof there are two parts:—[1.] The *exaltation* of the person, office, and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the *excellency* of the gospel and the worship therein commanded, revealed by him. [2.]

A *discovery of the nature, use, and expiration* of Mosaical institutions, their present unprofitableness, and ceasing of their obligation unto obedience. The former part we may grant to have been *equally* the design of all the apostles, though we find it in a peculiar way insisted on in the writings of Paul; the latter was his special work and business. This, partly *ex instituto*, partly *occasionally*, from the opposition of the Jews, was he engaged in the promotion of, all the world over. The apostles of the Circumcision, according to the wisdom given them, and suitably to the nature of their work, did more accommodate themselves to the prejudicate opinion of the Jewish professors; and the rest of the apostles had little occasion to deal with them or others on this subject. Paul in an eminent manner in this work bare the burden of that day. Having well settled *all other churches* which were troubled in this controversy by some of the Jews, he at last treats with themselves *directly* in this Epistle, giving an account of what he had elsewhere preached and taught to this purpose, and the grounds that he proceeded upon; and this not without great success, as the burying of the Judaical controversy not long after doth manifest.

(2.) The *method of his procedure* is the same with that of his other epistles, which also was peculiar unto him. Now, this in most of them, yea, in all of them not regulated by some *particular occasions*, is first to lay down the *doctrinal mysteries* of the gospel, vindicating them from oppositions and exceptions, and then to descend to exhortations unto obedience deduced from them, with an enumeration of such *special moral duties* as those unto whom he wrote stood in need to be minded of. This is the *general method* of his Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and the most of the rest. And this also is observed in this Epistle. Only, whereas he had a special respect unto the apostasy of some of the Hebrews, occasioned by the persecution which then began to grow high against them, whatever argument or testimony in his passage gave him advantage to press an *exhortation* unto constancy, and to deter them from *backsliding*, he lays hold upon it, and diverts into *practical inferences* unto that purpose, before he comes to his general exhortations towards the end of the Epistle. Excepting this *occasional* difference, the *method* of this is the same with that used in the other epistles of Paul, and which was *peculiarly* his own.

(3.) His *way of argument* in this and his other epistles is the same. Now this, as we shall see, is *sublime* and *mystical*, accommodated rather to the *spiritual reason* of believers than the *artificial rules* of philosophers. That he should more abound with *testimonies* and quotations out of the scriptures of the Old Testament in this than other epistles, as he doth, the *matter* whereof he treats and the *persons* to whom he wrote did necessarily require.

(4.) *Many things* in this Epistle evidently manifest that he who wrote it was not only "*mighty* in the Scriptures," but also exceedingly well *versed* and skilful in the customs, practices, opinions, traditions, expositions and applications of Scripture, then received in the Judaical church, as we shall fully manifest in our progress. Now, who in those days, among the disciples of Christ, could this be but Paul? for as he was brought up under one of the best and most famous of their masters in those days, and "profited in the knowledge" of their then present religion "above his equals," so for want of this kind of learning, the Jews esteemed the chief of the other apostles, Peter and John, to be *idiots and unlearned.*

(5.) Sundry particulars towards and in the close of the Epistle openly proclaim Paul to have been the writer of it; as,—[1.] The mention that he makes of *his "bonds," and the "compassion" that the Hebrews showed towards him in his sufferings* and whilst he was a prisoner, chap. x. 34. Now, as the "bonds" of Paul were afterwards famous at Rome, Phil. i. 13, so there was not any thing of greater notoriety, in reference to the church of God in those days, than those that he suffered in Judea, which he minds them of in this expression. With what earnest endeavours, what rage and tumult, the rulers and body of the people sought his destruction, how *publicly* and with what solemnity his cause was sundry times heard and debated, with the time of his imprisonment that ensued, are all declared in the Acts at large. Now, no man can imagine but that, whilst this *great champion* of their profession was so *publicly pleading their cause,* and exposed to so much danger and hazard thereby, all the believers of those parts were exceedingly solicitous about his condition (as they had been about Peter's in the like case), and gave him all the assistance and encouragement that they were able. This "compassion" of theirs, and his own "bonds," as an evidence of his *faith* and their *mutual love* in the gospel, he now minds them of. Of no other person but Paul have we any ground to conjecture that this might be spoken. And yet the *suffering and compassion* here mentioned seem not to have been "things done in a corner." So that this one circumstance is able, of itself, to enervate all the exceptions that are made use of against his being esteemed the author of this Epistle. [2.] *The mention of Paul's dear and constant companion* Timothy is of the same importance, chap. xiii. 23. That Timothy was at Rome with Paul in his bonds is expressly asserted, Phil. i. 13, 14, ii. 19–24. That he himself was also cast into prison with Paul is here intimated, his *release* being expressed. Now, surely it is scarcely credible that any other should, in Italy, where Paul then was, and newly released out of prison, write unto the churches of the Hebrews, and therein make mention of *his own bonds* and the *bonds of Timothy,* a man unknown unto them but by the means of Paul, and

not once intimate any thing about *his* condition. The exceptions of some, as that Paul used to call Timothy his "son," whereas the writer of this Epistle calls him "brother" (when, indeed, he never terms him "son" when he speaks *of* him, but only when he wrote *unto* him), or that there might be another Timothy (when he speaks expressly of him who was so generally known to the churches of God as one of the chiefest evangelists), deserve not to be insisted on. And surely it is altogether incredible that this Timothy, the "*son*" of Paul, as to his begetting of him in the faith and continued paternal affection; his known, constant *associate* in doing and suffering for the gospel; his *minister* in attending of him, and constantly *employed* by him in the service of Christ and the churches; *known* unto them by his means; *honoured* by him with two epistles written unto him, and the association of his name with his own in the inscription of sundry others,—should now be so absent from him as to be adjoined unto another in his travail and ministry. [3.] The *constant sign* and token of Paul's epistles, which himself had publicly signified to be so, 2 Thess. iii. 17, is subjoined unto this, "Grace be with you all." That originally this was written with Paul's *own hand* there is no ground to question; and it appears to be so, because it was written, and he affirms that it was his *custom* to subjoin that salutation *with his own hand.* Now, this writing of it *with his own hand* was an evidence unto *them* unto whom the *original* of the Epistle first came; unto *those* who had only transcribed *copies* of it, it could not be so. The *salutation* itself was their *token*, being peculiar to Paul, and among the rest annexed to this Epistle. And all these circumstances will yet receive some further enforcement from the consideration of the *time* wherein this Epistle was written, whereof in the next place we shall treat.

SUBSIDIARY NOTE ON EXERCITATION II.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE progress of discussion on the interesting question in Biblical literature with which the preceding Exercitation is occupied, would form matter of a very long historical excursion. It must suffice for our purpose to indicate its principal outlines; referring, for our authorities and sources of information, to the introductory dissertations of Hallet, Tholuck, and Stuart, together with Davidson's "Introduction to the New Testament," and Forster's work on "The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews."

There are three leading opinions entertained in regard to the authorship of the Epistle:—I. Some ascribe it to other authors than Paul; II. Some ascribe it directly and exclusively to Paul; III. Some ascribe it to Paul in concert or conjunction with another author, and this other author is held to be,—1. according to some, Apollos; and 2. according to others, Luke.

I. In the first class six different names are mentioned as the authors of the Epistle:—1. CLEMENT of Rome, in the judgment of Erasmus and Patrick Young; 2. TERTULLIAN, according to Sixtus Senensis; 3. BARNABAS, according to Tertullian, Schmidt, Cameron, Twesten, Ullman, Wieseler; 4. LUKE, according to Origen, S. Crell, Grotius,

and Koehler; 5. SILAS, according to Mynster and Boehme; and, 6. APOLLOS, according to Luther, Le Clerc, L. Müller, Heumann, Semler, Ziegler, Dindorf, Schott, Bleek, Feilmoser, De Wette, Credner, Röth, Reuss, Olshausen, and Tholuck.

In regard to all these views, it may be observed in general,—first, That none of them, if we exclude the opinions of Tertullian and Origen, rests on a respectable historical basis; secondly, That even in the case of Origen, his assertion cannot be taken as directly and absolutely ascribing the authorship of the Epistle to any but Paul; thirdly, That their very contrariety and multitude imply the uncertainty of the evidence adduced in their favour; fourthly, That they are mostly dependent on internal evidence, and that, with the exception of one or two of them, this evidence is vague and slender; and fifthly, The opinion that Apollos was the author, which, of all the six, has the greatest weight and number of suffrages, is supported chiefly by the argument, that the Epistle, from its typical explanation of the Jewish ritual, has an Alexandrine hue and colouring, and that it resembles the writings of Philo. In reply, first, it has been proved that typical interpretation prevailed in Palestine as well as Alexandria; secondly, Paul, in an epistle undoubtedly his,—the Epistle to the Galatians,—deals with the principle of allegory, upon which the idea of alleged resemblance to Philo is founded; and thirdly, on the same inconclusive grounds, part of the Gospel of John has been ascribed to a Philonian origin.

II. The *evidence* that PAUL was the author is both *external* and *internal*. The *external evidence* is as follows:—

1. In the *Western* church, from the fourth century, this view was held by Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus, Chromatius, Innocent of Rome, Paulinus, Cassian, Prosper, Eucherius, Salvian, and Gelasius.

2. In the *Alexandrine* church, by Pantænus, Origen, Dionysius, Theognostus, Peter, Alexander, Hierax, Athanasius, Theophilus, Serapion, Didymus, and Cyril of Alexandria.

3. In the *Greek* church, the synod at Antioch A.D. 264, Gregory Thaumaturgus, the council of Nice A.D. 315, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil the Great, the council of Laodicea A.D. 360, Gregory of Nyssa, Titus of Bostra, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, assign it to the same author.

4. In the *Syrian* church the same opinion generally prevailed, as appears from Justin Martyr, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Jacob of Nisibis, Ephraim Syrus.

5. In the *African* church, the council of Hippo A.D. 393, the third council of Carthage A.D. 397, and the sixth council of Carthage A.D. 419, decide in favour of the same view.

The *internal evidence* has reference to,—

1. *Particular facts* mentioned in the Epistle:—(1.) chap. xiii. 23; (2.) chap. xiii. 18, 19; (3.) chap. x. 34 (but the true reading, *τοῖς δεσμίοις*, not *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, destroys the inference founded on this expression); (4.) chap. xiii. 24. These facts, the first as indicating friendly relations to Timothy, the second as accordant with Paul's mode of giving such promises elsewhere, and the last as marking a locality where Paul was for a time under restraint, have a Pauline complexion.

2. The *general plan* of the Epistle, as doctrinal and practical, and concluded with requests for an interest in the prayers of those to whom it was written.

3. *Doctrinal contents:*—(1.) On Christ's person. Compare chap. i. 3, with 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15; Phil. ii. 6. (2.) On Christ's work as mediator:—the office of mediator, chap. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 5;—his humiliation, chap. ii. 9, xii. 2, 3; Phil. ii. 8;—his death, chap. ix. 26, 28, x. 12; Rom. vi. 9, 10;—results of his death, chap. ii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55; 2 Tim. i. 10;—his resurrection and exaltation, chap. ix. 26, 28, vii. 26, iv. 14; Rom. vi. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 10;—his intercession, chap. vii. 25; Rom. viii. 34;—his session and reign at the right hand of God, chap. i. 3, x. 12, ii. 8, ix. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. (3.) Blessings and privileges of believers;—access to the Father, chap. x. 19, 20; Eph. ii. 18; Rom. v. 2;—Pauline triad of faith, hope, and love, chap. x. 22–24; 1 Cor. xiii. 13;—importance of faith, chap. ii. 1–4, x. 38, xi. 39; Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6–14. (4.) These truths, as entering into the essence of the gospel, may not so clearly establish the identity of the writer as certain *special topics*, which Moses Stuart sums up thus:—superior light under the gospel, chap. i. 1, 2, ii. 1–4, viii. 8–11, x. 1, xi. 39, 40; Gal. iv. 1–9; 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 11–13;—superior motives to virtue and religion, chap. ii. 9, ix. 14, xii. 18–24, 28, viii. 6–12; Gal. iii. 23, iv. 1–3; Rom. viii. 15, 17; 1 Cor. vii. 19;—superior efficacy of the gospel in promoting the happiness of mankind, chap. xii. 18–24, ix. 9, x. 4, 11, ix. 11–14, v. 9, vi. 18, ii. 14, 15, vii. 25, ix. 24; Gal. iii. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 7–9; Gal. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 20, iv. 24, 25; Eph. i. 7; Rom. v. 1, 2;—the Jewish dispensation was a type

of the Christian, chap. ix. 9–14, x. 1; Col. ii. 16, 17; 1 Cor. x. 1–6, 11; Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45–47; 2 Cor. iii. 13–18; Gal. iv. 22–31;—while the Christian dispensation is to be perpetual, the Jewish institutes are abolished, chap. viii. 6–8, x. 1–14; 2 Cor. iii. 11, 13; Rom. iv. 14–16; Gal. iii. 21–25, iv. 1–7.

4. The *tenor of the practical exhortations* at the close of the Epistle, as harmonizing with what appears at the end of other epistles, chap. xii. 3; Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13; Eph. iii. 13;—chap. xii. 14; Rom. xii. 18;—chap. xiii. 1–4; Eph. v. 2–5;—chap. xiii. 16; Phil. iv. 18.

5. The *mode of quotation* from the Old Testament scriptures:—(1.) Without notice of quotation, chap. iii. 2, 5, x. 37, xi. 21; Rom. ix. 7, 21, x. 6–8, xi. 34. (2.) In the way of *argumentum ad hominem*, or *ex concessis*, chap. vii., viii. 1–5, ix. 1–9; Gal. iv. 24; 1 Cor. ix. 9, x. 2; Eph. v. 31, 32. (3.) In reference to the abolition of the Jewish economy, the writer of the Epistle speaks in the same way as Paul generally does.

6. *Similarity of phrase and style;* such as,—(1.) Identical and synonymous expressions, chap. i. 3; Col. i. 15; Phil. ii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 17, etc. (2.) Words in the Septuagint or Apocrypha occurring only in Paul's epistles, and that to the Hebrews; such as, ἀγών, ἀδόκιμος, αἱρέομαι, ἄκακος, εὐάρεστος, ὑπόστασις, φράττω, etc. (3.) Word's occurring only in Paul's epistles, and that to the Hebrews: αἰδὼς ὀφείγομαι, παρακοή, πηλίκος, etc. (4.) Words, in the manner or frequency of their occurrence, peculiar to Paul's epistles, and that to the Hebrews: ἁγιασμός, βεβαιόω, γυμνάζω, μέμφομαι, σκιά, etc. (5.) Peculiarities of grammatical construction, chap. vii.: ὁ λαὸς ἐπ' αὐτῇ νενομοθέτηπο, Rom. iii. 2, vi. 17, 1 Tim. i. 11, the nominative being made the subject, instead of νενομοθέτηπο λαῷ. (6.) An adjective used to express a generic quality, instead of a noun, chap. vi. 17, xii. 13, 21; Rom. i. 19, ii. 4, iii. 1, vii. 3, ix. 22. (7.) The use of paronomasia, so common with Paul, chap. vii. 12, 13, ix. 16, viii. 13. (8.) The habit of sudden digression: chap. iii. 2, going off at the word *house;* chap. xii. 18–29, at the words *voice, speaketh, shook;* chap. xii. 5, at the word *chastening;* 2 Cor. ii. 14, iii. 1; Eph. iv. 8–10.

In evidence against the Pauline origin of the Epistle. it is customary to refer to,—

1. *Patristic authority:* Irenæus, Hippolytus, Caius, Marcion, Cyprian, and the fathers of the Western church, to the middle of the fourth century.

2. *The ignorance of Jewish rites* betrayed by the writer of the Epistle, Heb. ix. 1–5; an objection which, if true, impeaches the inspiration of the Epistle; but not to be admitted as true, and capable of satisfactory refutation.

3. The difference from the other epistolary productions of the apostle, in *the want of a title and inscription.*

4. The *language employed in Heb. ii.* 3; which is alleged to imply that the writer, along with the Hebrews to whom he wrote, had received the gospel from the apostles, and not, as Paul affirms of himself elsewhere, directly from Christ: an argument sufficiently met by the consideration, that to a certain extent the fact holds true of Paul, and that it is not uncommon for a writer to use language as if he were in the same position and circumstances with those whom he addresses, when there is substantial identity between them in privilege and responsibility. And,—

5. The *sustained elevation of thought* and *superior purity of the Greek,* for which the Epistle is remarkable. Considering, however, that it is mostly a calm exegesis of the meaning of typical institutions, designed to illustrate the transcendent dignity of the Founder of the Christian dispensation, the calmness of its tone and the elevation of the sentiments expressed in it are sufficiently explained; while, both in regard to this feature of the composition and the purity of the diction. it does not excel passages eminent for rhetorical power and skill in the acknowledged writings of the apostle: Rom. viii.; 1 Cor. xiii.

On a review of all the evidence, it seems established,—that the authorship of the Epistle, on no valid grounds, external or internal, can be traced to any but Paul; that nearly all the direct external evidence is in favour of the same conclusion; and that while there are one or two difficulties in regard to the internal evidence, the preponderance of it leads to the belief that Paul was the author, while even these difficulties are not absolutely incompatible with this belief.

III. The only remaining theory is, that Paul wrote the Epistle in concert with some other disciple as his assistant; so that while the sentiments are Paul's, the modification of the language may be due to the assistance of which he availed himself in the composition of it.

1. Some take this assistant to have been Apollos. "If it be considered," says Olshausen, "that there was always a certain distance of demeanour between the apostle

Paul and the Jewish Christians, even the best of them, it will be very easy to understand why Paul did not write to them himself; and still it must have been his heart's desire to exhibit clearly and in suitable detail his views in regard to the law, and its relation to Christianity. What more obvious mode of presenting these to the Hebrews than through the medium of a disciple or faithful friend, who, like Apollos, had a correct apprehension of this relation between the old and new covenant?"

2. Others regard LUKE as the assistant whose services were employed. That the composition is not Paul's Dr Davidson argues, because "the tone is elevated, rhetorical, calm, unlike the fiery force of Paul's manner. There is polish, care, elegance.—No trace of the apostle's characteristic manner appears. Besides, would it not be anomalous, that the apostle himself should adopt a purer Greek and higher style of writing in an Epistle addressed to the Jewish Christians in Palestine?—We are thus brought to the position that it did not receive its present form from Paul. It is better Greek than his.—The style and diction of the Epistle resemble Luke's in the Acts more nearly than any other part of the New Testament. The likeness between the style of our Epistle and that of Luke's writings is by no means such as to show identity of *authorship*. The reasons are strong for maintaining that Paul was the author, and that Luke did not *translate* it from one language to another. Yet this does not militate against the notion that Luke had a part in putting the thoughts and words of Paul into their present form. What was the nature of the service he rendered, it is impossible to discover."

This theory was proposed by Origen, on the ground, to use his own words, that "the Epistle is purer Greek in the texture of its style." "I would say," he adds, "that the sentiments are the apostle's, but the language and the composition belong to some one who committed to writing what the apostle said, and as it were reduced to commentaries the things spoken by his master."

Serious objections impede the reception of this theory:—1. It leaves altogether undefined the relation between Paul and his supposed assistant, the functions neither of amanuensis, nor reporter, nor translator, nor editor, serving to account for the peculiarity of diction which has led to the suggestion of the theory. 2. It proves too much; for the qualities specified as indicating the difference between this Epistle and the known writings of Paul relate to idiosyncrasies of character in thought and feeling, which foreign aid in the mere composition of the Epistle cannot explain. If Luke so little interfered with the tenor of the thinking that his services did not even involve translation, what he did for it could not account for the sustained calmness of the discussion, and the absence of that fiery vividness of conception and appeal which are conceived to be the "nodus" rendering Luke necessary as the only "vindex" capable of resolving it. If Luke did for the Epistle what is esteemed a service adequate to explain its special phenomena, he is entitled to the full honours of its literary parentage. 3. This view supposes the possibility of separating thought from language, ascribing the former to one author and the latter to another, in a way which creates a difficulty greater than that to meet which the theory is invented. 4. There is no greater anomaly in supposing that Paul himself polished his own sentences more carefully in writing to the Hebrew Christians, than in the supposition that he employed another to do it. And, lastly, is difference of style, the only real and valid ground on which adventitious help is claimed for the apostle in the preparation of this inspired document, a sufficient reason to be very anxious in pressing such a theory? In common literature, very remarkable differences in the style of the same author in different works might be mentioned. Paul wrote the Epistle, it is believed, at an advanced period of his course, and after he had mingled for years with multitudes who spoke the language in the utmost purity of that age; and with the advantage of leisure for the composition of the Epistle, his mind rising to a kindred and congenial elevation with the theme of which he treats,—the surpassing glories of his Lord and Saviour,—and borrowing a hue of peculiar solemnity from his own anticipated doom as a martyr for the truth, he might infuse a tone of dignity into his very language enough to vindicate the Epistle as implicitly and entirely his own.

EXERCITATION III.

THE TIME [AND OCCASION] OF THE WRITING OF THIS EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

1. The time of the writing of this Epistle to the Hebrews—The use of the right stating thereof. 2. After his release out of prison—Before the death of James—Before the Second [Epistle] of Peter. 3. The time of Paul's coming to Rome. 4. The condition of the affairs of the Jews at that time. 5. The martyrdom of James. 6. By whom reported. 7. State of the churches of the Hebrews. 8. Constant in the observation of Mosaical institutions. 9. Warned to leave Jerusalem. 10. That warning what, and how given—Causes of their unwillingness so to do. 11. The occasion and success of this Epistle.

1. THAT was not amiss observed of old by Chrysostom, Præfat. in Com. ad Epist. ad Rom., that a due observation of the *time* and season wherein the epistles of Paul were written doth give great light into the understanding of many passages in them. This Baronius, ad an. 55, n. 42, well confirms by an instance of their mistake who suppose the shipwreck of Paul at Melita, Acts xxvii., to have been that mentioned by him, 2 Cor. xi. 25, when he was "a night and a day in the deep," that epistle being written some years before his sailing towards Rome. And we may well apply this observation to this Epistle unto the Hebrews. A discovery of the *time* and season wherein it was written will both free us from sundry mistakes and also give us some light into the *occasion* and design of it. This, therefore, we shall now inquire into.

2. Some general intimations we have, in the Epistle itself, leading us towards *this discovery*, and somewhat may be gathered from some other places of Scripture; for *antiquity* will afford us little or no help herein. After Paul's being brought a *prisoner to Rome*, Acts xxviii., "two whole years" he continued in that condition, verse 30; at least so long he continued under restraint, though "in his own hired house." This time was expired before the writing of this Epistle; for he was not only absent from Rome, in some other part of Italy, when he wrote it, Heb. xiii. 24, but also so far at liberty, and *sui juris*, as that he had entertained a resolution of going into the east as soon as Timothy should come unto him, ver. 23. And it seems likewise to be written before the martyrdom of James at Jerusalem, in that he affirms that the church of the Hebrews had "not yet resisted unto blood," chap. xii. 4; it being very probable that together with him many others were slain. Many great difficulties they had been exercised withal; but as yet the matter was not come to "blood," which shortly after it arrived unto. That is certain, also, that it was not only *written*, but *communicated* unto, and well known by, all the believing Jews before the writing of the second Epistle of Peter; who therein makes mention of it, as we have declared. Much light,

I confess, as to the precise time of its writing is not hence to be obtained, because of the uncertainty of the time wherein Peter wrote that epistle. Only it appears, from what he affirms concerning the *approaching* of the time of his suffering, chap. i. 13, 14, that it was not long before his death. This, as is generally agreed, happened in the *thirteenth year of Nero,* when a great progress was made in that war which ended in the fatal and final destruction of the city and temple.

3. From these observations it appears that the best guide we have to find out the certain *time* of the *writing* of this Epistle is Paul's being sent prisoner unto Rome. Now, this was in the first year of the government of Festus, after he had been two years detained in prison at Cæsarea by Felix, Acts xxiv. 27, xxv. 26, 27. This Felix was the brother of Pallas, who ruled all things under Claudius, and fell into some disgrace in the very first year of Nero, as Tacitus informs us; but yet, by the countenance of Agrippina, the mother of Nero, he continued in some regard until the *fifth* or *sixth* year of his reign, when, together with his mother, he destroyed many of her friends and favourites. During this time of Pallas' declension in power, it is most probable that his brother Felix was displaced from the rule of his province, and Festus sent in his room. That it was before his utter ruin, in the *sixth* year of Nero, is evident from hence, because he made [use of] means to keep his brother from punishment, when he was accused for extortion and oppression by the Jews. Most probably, then, Paul was sent unto Rome about the *fourth* or *fifth* year of Nero, which was the *fifty-ninth* year from the nativity of the Lord Jesus Christ. There he abode, as we showed, at the least two years in custody, where the story of the Acts of the Apostles ends, in the *seventh* year of Nero, and *sixty-first* of our Lord, or the beginning of the year following. That year, it is presumed, he obtained his liberty. And this was about thirteen years after the determination of the controversy about Mosaical institutions, as to their obligation on the Gentiles, made by the synod at Jerusalem, Acts xv. Presently upon his liberty, whilst he abode in some part of Italy expecting the coming of Timothy, before he entered upon the journey he had promised unto the Philippians, chap. ii. 24, he wrote this Epistle. Here, then, we must stay a little, to consider what was the general state and condition of the Hebrews in those days, which might give occasion unto the writing thereof.

4. The *time* fixed on was about the death of Festus, who died in the province, and the beginning of the government of Albinus, who was sent to succeed him. What was *the state of the people* at that time, Josephus declares at large in his second book of their Wars. In brief, the governors themselves being great oppressors, and rather mighty robbers amongst them than rulers, the whole nation was

filled with spoil and violence. What through the fury and outrage of the soldiers, in the pursuit of their insatiable avarice; what through the incursions of thieves and robbers in troops and companies, wherewith the whole land abounded; and what through the tumults of seditious persons, daily incited and provoked by the cruelty of the Romans,—there was no peace or safety for any sober, honest men, either in the city of Jerusalem or anywhere else throughout the whole province. That the *church* had a great share of suffering in the outrage and misery of those days (as in such dissolutions of government and licence for all wickedness it commonly falls out), no man can question. And this is that which the apostle mentions, chap. x. 32–34, "Ye endured a great fight of afflictions; partly, whilst ye were made a gazing-stock, both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, whilst ye became companions of them that were so used; . . . . and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods." This was the lot and portion of all honest and sober-minded men in those days, as their historian at large declares. For as, no doubt, the Christians had a principal share in all those sufferings, so some others of the Jews also were their companions in them; it being not a *special persecution*, but a *general calamity* that the apostle speaks of.

5. One Joseph, the son of Cæbias, was in the beginning of those days high priest; put into that office by Agrippa, who not long before had put him out. On the death of Festus he thrust him out again, and placed Ananus, his son, in his stead. This man, a young rash fellow, by sect and opinion a Sadducee (who of all others were the most violent in their hatred of the Christians, being especially engaged therein by the peculiar opinion of their sect and party, which was *the denial of the resurrection*), first began a direct persecution of the church. Before his advancement to the priesthood, their afflictions and calamities were, for the most part, common unto them with other peaceable men. Only the *rude and impious multitude*, with other seditious persons, seem to have offered especial violences unto their assemblies and meetings; which some of the more unsteadfast and weak began to *omit* on that account, chap. x. 25. *Judicial* proceeding against them as to their lives, when this Epistle was written, there doth not appear to have been any; for the apostle tells them, as we before observed, that as yet they had "not resisted unto blood," chap. xii. 4. But this Ananus, the Sadducee, presently after being placed in power by Agrippa, taking advantage of the death of Festus, and the time that passed before Albinus, his successor, was settled in the province, convenes James before himself and his associates. There, to make short work, he is condemned, and immediately *stoned*. And it is not unlikely but that other private persons suffered together with him.

6. The story, by the way, of the martyrdom of this James is at large reported by Eusebius out of Hegesippus, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xxiii.; in the relation whereof he is followed by Jerome and sundry others. I shall say no more of the whole story, but that the consideration of it is very sufficient to persuade any man to use the *liberty* of his own reason and judgment in the perusal of the writings of the ancients. For of the *circumstances* therein reported about this James and his death, many of them,—as his being of the line of the priests, his entering at his pleasure into the sanctum sanctorum, his being carried up and set by a great multitude of people on a pinnacle of the temple,—are so *palpably false* that no colour of probability can be given unto them, and most of the rest seem altogether incredible. That, in general, this holy apostle of Jesus Christ, his kinsman according to the flesh, was stoned by Ananus, during the anarchy between the governments of Festus and Albinus, Josephus, who then lived, testifies, and all ecclesiastical historians agree.

7. The churches at this time in Jerusalem and Judea were very numerous. The oppressors, robbers, and seditious of all sorts, being wholly intent upon the pursuit of their own ends, filling the government of the nation with tumults and disorders; the disciples of Christ, who knew that the time of their preaching the gospel unto their countrymen was but short, and even now expiring, followed their work with diligence and success,—being not greatly regarded in the dust of that confusion which was raised by the nation's rushing into its fatal ruin.

8. All these churches, and the multitudes that belonged unto them, were altogether, with the profession of the gospel, *addicted zealously unto the observation of the law of Moses.* The synod, indeed, at Jerusalem had determined that the *yoke of the law* should not be put upon the necks of the Gentile converts, Acts xv. But *eight* or *nine* years after that, when Paul came up unto Jerusalem again, chap. xxi. 20–22, James informs him that the many thousands of the Jews who believed did all zealously observe the law of Moses; and, moreover, judged that all those who were Jews by birth ought to do so also; and on that account were like enough to assemble in a disorderly multitude, to inquire into the practice of Paul himself, who had been ill reported of amongst them. On this account they kept their assemblies distinct from those of the Gentiles all the world over; as, amongst others, Jerome informs us, in his notes on the first chapter of the Galatians. All those Hebrews, then, to whom Paul wrote this Epistle, continued in the use and practice of Mosaical worship, as celebrated in the temple and their synagogues, with all other legal institutions whatever. Whether they did this out of an unacquaintedness with their liberty in Christ,

or out of a pertinacious adherence unto their own prejudicate opinions, I shall not determine.

9. From this time forward the body of the people of the Jews saw not a day of peace or quietness: tumults, seditions, outrages, robberies, murders, increased all the nation over. And these things, by various degrees, made way for that fatal war, which, beginning about six or seven years after the death of James, ended in the utter desolation of the people, city, temple, and worship, foretold so long before by Daniel the prophet, and intimated by our Saviour to lie at the door. This was that "day of the Lord" whose sudden approach the apostle declares unto them, chap. x. 36, 37, "For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry." Μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον,—'"A very little while," less than you think of, or imagine;' the manner whereof he declares, chap. xii. 26, 27. And by this means he effectually diverted them from a pertinacious adherence unto those things whose dissolution from God himself was so nigh at hand; which argument was also afterwards pressed by Peter, 2 Epist. chap. iii.

10. Our blessed Saviour had long before warned his disciples of all these things, particularly of the desolation that was to come upon the whole people of the Jews, with the tumults, distresses, persecutions, and wars, which should precede; directing them to the exercise of patience in the discharge of their duty, until the approach of the final calamity; out of which he advised them to free themselves by *flight*, or a timely departure out of Jerusalem and all Judea, Matt. xxiv. 15–21. This, and no other, was the *oracle* mentioned by Eusebius, whereby the Christians were warned to depart out of Jerusalem. It was given, as he says, τοῖς δοκίμοις, to "approved men" amongst them; for although the *prophecy* itself was written by the evangelists, yet the *especial meaning of it* was not known and divulged amongst all. The leaders of them kept this *secret* for a season, lest, an exasperation of the people being occasioned thereby, they should have been obstructed in the work which they had to do, before its accomplishment. And this was the way of the apostles also as to other future events, which, being foretold by them, might provoke either Jews or Gentiles if publicly divulged, 2 Thess. ii. 5, 6. But now, when the work of the church among the Jews for that season was come to its close, the *elect* being gathered out of them, and the final desolation of the city and people appearing to be at hand, by a concurrence of *all the signs foretold* by our Saviour, those intrusted with the sense of that oracle warned their brethren to provide for that flight whereunto they were directed. That this flight and departure, probably with the loss of all their possessions, was grievous unto them, may easily be conceived. But that which

seems most especially to have perplexed them, was their relinquishment of that *worship of God* whereunto they had been so zealously addicted. That this would prove grievous unto them, our Saviour had before intimated, Matt. xxiv. 30. Hence were they so slow in their obedience unto that heavenly oracle, although excited with the remembrance of what befell Lot's wife in the like tergiversation. Nay, as is likely from this Epistle, many of them who had made *profession of the gospel*, rather than they would now utterly forego their *old way of worship*, deserted the faith, and, cleaving to their unbelieving countrymen, perished in their apostasy; whom our apostle in an especial manner forewarns of their inevitable and sore destruction, by that fire of God's indignation which was shortly to "devour the adversaries," to whom they associated themselves, chap. x. 25–31.

11. This was the time wherein this Epistle was written; this the condition of the Hebrews unto whom it was written, both in respect of their *political* and *ecclesiastical* estate. Paul, who had an inexpressible zeal and overflowing affection for his countrymen, being now in Italy, considering the present condition of their affairs;—how pertinaciously they adhered to Mosaical institutions; how near the approach of their utter abolition was; how backward, during that frame of spirit, they would be to save themselves, by fleeing from the midst of that perishing generation; what danger they were in to forego the *profession of the gospel*, when it could not be retained without a relinquishment of their former divine service and ceremonies,—writes this Epistle unto them, wherein he strikes at the very root of all their dangers and distresses. For, whereas all the danger of their abode in Jerusalem and Judea, and so of falling in the destruction of the city and people; all the fears the apostle had of their apostasy into Judaism; all their own disconsolations in reference unto their flight and departure,—arose from their adherence unto and zeal for the law of Moses; by declaring unto them the nature, use, end, and expiration of his ordinances and institutions, he utterly removes and takes away the ground and occasion of all the evils mentioned. This was the season wherein this Epistle was written, and these some of the principal occasions (though it had other reasons also, as we shall see afterwards) of its writing; and I no way doubt (though particular events of those days are buried in oblivion) but that, through His grace who moved and directed the apostle unto, and in, the writing of it, it was made signally effectual towards the *professing Hebrews*,—both to free them from that *yoke of bondage* wherein they had been detained, and to prepare them with cheerfulness unto the observation of *evangelical worship*, leaving their countrymen to perish in their sin and unbelief.

NOTE ON EXERCITATION III.

BY THE EDITOR.

It is generally agreed that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Mill, Wetstein, Tillemont, Calmet, and Lardner, hold that it was written in the year 63. Basnage, like Owen, is in favour of an earlier date, and ascribes it to A.D. 61. The most recent authority, Dr Davidson, remarks, "If the letter was written by Paul, it could only have proceeded from him during the first two years of his imprisonment noticed at the close of the Acts. It preceded the Second to Timothy, A.D. 62 or 63. It was thus composed in Italy, according to chap. xiii. 24, and in accordance as well with the subscription of many MSS. ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, as that of others, ἀπὸ Ῥώμης. But there is a difficulty in supposing that οἱ ἀπο τῆς Ἰταλίας would have been employed by the author if he were at Rome,—a difficulty which we cannot satisfactorily solve."

EXERCITATION IV.

THE LANGUAGE WHEREIN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS WAS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.

1. Of the language wherein this Epistle was originally written—Supposed to be the Hebrew. 2. Grounds of that supposition disproved. 3. Not translated by Clemens. 4. Written in Greek—Arguments for the proof thereof. 5. Of citations out of the LXX.

1. Because this Epistle was written to the Hebrews, most of the ancients granted that it was written in Hebrew. Clemens Alexandrinus was the first who asserted it; after whom, Origen gave it countenance; from whom Eusebius received it; and from him Jerome: which is the most ordinary progression of old reports. The main reason which induced them to embrace this persuasion, was a desire to free the Epistle from an exception against its being written by Paul, taken from the dissimilitude of the style used in it unto that of his other epistles. This being once admitted, though *causelessly*, they could think of no better answer, than that this supposed difference of *style* arose from the *translation* of this Epistle, which by the apostle himself was first written in Hebrew. Clemens Romanus is the person generally fixed on as the author of this translation; though some do faintly intimate that Luke the evangelist might possibly be the man that did it. But this objection from the diversity of style, which alone begat this persuasion, hath been already removed out of the way, so that it cannot be allowed to be a foundation unto any other supposition.

2. That which alone is added, to give countenance unto this opinion, is that which we mentioned at the entrance of this discourse,—namely, that the apostle writing unto the Hebrews, he did it in their own native language; which being also his own, it is no wonder if he were more copious and elegant in it than he was in the Greek,

whereunto *originally* he was a stranger, learning it, as Jerome supposeth, upon his conversion. But a man may modestly say unto all this, οὐδὲν ὑγιές. Every thing in this pretended reason of that which indeed never was, is so far from *certainty* that indeed it is beneath all *probability*.

For,—(1.) If this Epistle was written *originally* in Hebrew, whence comes it to pass that no copy of it in that language was ever read, seen, or heard of, by the most diligent collectors of all fragments of antiquity in the primitive times? Had ever any such thing been extant, whence came it, in particular, that Origen,—that prodigy of industry and learning,—should be able to attain no knowledge or report of it? (2.) If it were incumbent on Paul, writing unto the Hebrews, to write in their own language, why did he not also write in Latin unto the Romans? That he did so, indeed, Gratian affirms; but without pretence of proof or witness, contrary to the testimony of all antiquity, the evidence of the thing itself, and constant confession of the Roman church. And Erasmus says well on Rom. i. 7, "Coarguendus vel ridendus magis error eorum, qui putant Paulum Romanis linguâ Romanâ scripsisse;"—"The error of them is to be reproved (or rather, laughed at), who suppose Paul to have written unto the Romans in the Latin tongue." (3.) It is most unduly supposed that the Hebrew tongue was then the vulgar, common language of the Jews, when it was known only to the learned amongst them, and a corrupt Syriac was the common dialect of the people even at Jerusalem. (4.) It is as unduly averred that the Hebrew was the mother tongue of Paul himself, or that he was ignorant of the Greek; seeing he was born at Tarsus, in Cilicia, where that was the language that he was brought up in, and unto. (5.) The Epistle was written for the use of all the Hebrews in their several dispersions, especially that in the east, as Peter witnesseth, they being all alike concerned in the matter of it, though not so immediately as those in Judea and Jerusalem. Now, unto those the Greek language, from the days of the Macedonian empire, had been in vulgar use, and continued so to be. (6.) The Greek tongue was so well known and so much used in Judea itself, that, as a learned man hath proved by sundry testimonies out of their most ancient writings, it was called the vulgar amongst them.

I know, among the rabbins there is mention of a prohibition of learning the Greek tongue; and in the Jerusalem Talmud itself, Tit. Peah. cap. i., they add a reason of it, מפני המסורות; it was because of traitors, lest they should betray their brethren, and none understand them. But as this is contrary unto what themselves teach about the *knowledge of tongues* required in those who were to be chosen into the sanhedrim, so it is sufficiently disproved by the instances of the translators of the Bible, Jesus Syrachides, Philo, Jo-

sephus, and others among themselves. And though Josephus affirms, Antiq., lib. xx. cap. xi., that the study of the *elegance of tongues* was of no great reckoning amongst them, yet he grants that they were studied by all sorts of men. Nor doth this pretended decree of *prohibition* concern our times, it being made, as they say, Mishn. Tit. Sota., in the last wars of Titus: בפולמוסין של טיטוס גזרו שלא ילמד אדם את בנו יונית;—"In the wars of Titus, they decreed that no man should teach his son the Greek language:" for it must be distinguished from the decree of the Asmoneans long before, prohibiting the study of the Grecian philosophy. So that this pretence is destitute of all colour, being made up of many vain, and evidently false, suppositions.

3. Again, the Epistle is said to be translated by Clemens, but where, or when, we are not informed. Was this done in Italy, before it was sent unto the Hebrews? To what end, then, was it written in Hebrew, when it was not to be used but in Greek? Was it sent in Hebrew before the supposed translation? In what language was it communicated unto others by them who first received it? Clemens was never in the east to translate it. And if all the *first copies* of it were dispersed in Hebrew, how came they to be so utterly lost as that no report or tradition of them, or any one of them, did ever remain? Besides, if it were translated by Clemens in the west, and that translation alone preserved, how came it to pass that it was so well known and generally received in the east before the western churches admitted of it? This tradition, therefore, is also every way groundless and improbable.

4. Besides, there want not *evidences* in the Epistle itself, proving it to be originally written in the language wherein it is yet extant. I shall only point at the heads of them, for this matter deserves no long discourse:—(1.) The *style* of it throughout manifests it to be no translation; at least, it is impossible it should be one exact and proper, as its own copiousness, propriety of phrase and expression, with freedom from savouring of the Hebraisms of an *original* in that language, do manifest. (2.) It abounds with Greek elegancies and paronomasias, that have no countenance given unto them by any thing in the Hebrew tongue; such as that, for instance, chap. v. 8, Ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν,—from the like expressions whereunto in the story of Susanna, ver. 55, 56, Ὑπὸ σχῖνον, σχίσει σε μέσον, and ver. 59, Ὑπὸ πρίνον, πρίσαι σε μέσον, it is well proved that it was written *originally* in the Greek language. (3.) The rendering of בְּרִית constantly by διαθήκη (of which more afterwards) is of the same importance. (4.) The words concerning Melchisedec, king of Salem, chap. vii. 2, prove the same: Πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστι βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης. Had the Epistle been written in Hebrew, what need this ἑρμηνεία? That מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק is, being interpreted, מֶלֶךְ צֶדֶק, is a strange kind of interpretation; and so also is it that

מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם is מֶלֶךְ שָׁלוֹם. When John reports the words of Mary, Ῥαββουνί, and adds of his own, ὃ λέγεται, διδάσκαλε, "that is to say, Master," John xx. 16, doth any man doubt but that he wrote in Greek, and therefore so rendered her Syriac expression? And is not the same evident concerning our apostle, from the interpretation that he gives of those Hebrew words? And it is in vain to reply, that these words were added by the translator, seeing the very *argument* of the author is founded on the interpretation of those words which he gives us. It appears, then, that as the assertion that this Epistle was written in Hebrew is altogether groundless,—and it arose from many false suppositions, which render it more incredible than if it made use of no pretence at all,—so there want not evidences from the Epistle itself of its being *originally* written in the language wherein it is still extant, and those such as few other books of the New Testament can afford concerning themselves, should the same question be made about them.

5. Moreover, in the confirmation of our persuasion, it is by some added that the *testimonies* made use of in this Epistle out of the Old Testament are taken out of the *translation* of the LXX., and that sometimes the stress of the argument taken from them relies on somewhat peculiar to that version; which was not possible to have been done had it been written *originally* in Hebrew. But because this assertion contains other difficulties in it, and is built on a supposition which deserves a further examination, we shall refer it unto its own place and season, which ensues.

SUBSIDIARY NOTE ON EXERCITATION IV.

BY THE EDITOR.

On the point discussed in the previous Exercitation, a difference of an early date exists among critics. Clement of Alexandria held that "Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language, and that Luke carefully translated it into Greek," Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 14. Eusebius says, "Paul wrote to the Hebrews in his vernacular language, and, according to report, either Luke or Clement" (*i.e.*, of Rome) "translated it," Euseb. iii. 38. Jerome remarks, "He had written as a Hebrew to Hebrews, in the Hebrew tongue," and "this Epistle was translated into Greek; so that the colouring of the style was made different in this way from that of Paul's." The following fathers may be named as holding the same opinion,—Theodoret, Euthalius, Primasius, Johannes Damascenus, Œcumenius, and Theophylact.

The principal reasons for believing that the Epistle extant is merely the Greek translation of an Aramæan original are, first, the difference of style in it from the rest of Paul's epistles, but this point has been considered already in the subsidiary note to the second Exercitation; and, secondly, that Hebrews are addressed, to whom their native tongue would be more acceptable. But the Greek tongue, by the time this Epistle was written, had obtained great currency in Palestine. Jerusalem was soon to be destroyed, the system of Judaism was verging on abolition, and the Jewish Christians were to be blended with their Gentile brethren of the faith. The employment of the Greek tongue in the inspired writings tended to facilitate the happy amalgamation.

Some considerations, in addition to what are noticed by Owen, have been deemed of force in support of a Greek original.

Greek words occur which in Hebrew could be expressed only by a periphrasis:—Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, ch. i. 1; ἀπαύγασμα, ch. i. 3; εὐπερίστατος, ch. xii. 1; μετριοπαθεῖν, ch. v. 2; πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑπὸ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, ch. ii. 8. "The verb in this clause," to use the argument of Hug, which is thus well put by Dr Davidson, "is repeated in the context, Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην, ch. ii. 5; ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον, ... ὁ ῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα, ch. ii. 8. But in Hebrew, the verb ὑποτάσσω is expressed by a periphrasis, שִׁית תַּחַת רַגְלָיִם, *to place under the feet*, and if the Epistle was written in Hebrew, the expressions derived from ὑποτάσσω could not have been employed in that language, in consequence of the often repeated circumlocution."

Moreover, since the time of Owen, there is greater evidence of the probability that an apostle writing to the Christians in Palestine would write in Greek. The opinion of De Rossi that Syro-Chaldaic was almost exclusively used in that country has yielded before subsequent inquiries. Hug shows that our Lord must have spoken Greek in various districts, Mark vii. 24, and with the Hellenists mentioned John vii. 35, xii. 20; that the language of the Roman magistracy was probably Greek; that considerable cities in Palestine were inhabited by Greeks; that the Roman garrisons spoke Greek; that the foreign Jews at the feast of the passover, amounting to hundreds of thousands, used the same language; that the Jews who spoke Greek had their own synagogue in Jerusalem, Acts vi. 9, ix. 29; and that a great number of the Christian Jews spoke it freely, Acts vi. 1, 2. Tholuck adds that James, who had never left Palestine, to judge from his Epistle, wrote Greek with elegance; and that the Septuagint must have been in common use among the Jews of Palestine, when Matthew and John generally follow it. The best evidence on this point is a passage sometimes appealed to in order to obtain an opposite inference, Acts xxi. 40. Though Paul spoke in the Hebrew tongue, the multitude expected him to address them in Greek. Order and attention were secured when the sounds of their native language fell upon their ear. The fact shows, however, that they were able and prepared to understand him in Greek. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Paul was writing to Christians, and under no necessity to conciliate attention by such an expedient. It was natural, therefore, that he should write in the language in which he had been educated at Tarsus, and in which he wrote all his other epistles.

EXERCITATION V.

TESTIMONIES CITED BY THE APOSTLE OUT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Testimonies cited by the apostle out of the Old Testament. 2–12. Compared with the original and translations. 13–23. Whence the agreement of some of them with that of the LXX.

1. THERE is not any thing in this Epistle that is attended with more difficulty than the *citation of the testimonies out of the Old Testament* that are made use of in it. Hence some, from their *unsuitableness*, as they have supposed, unto the author's purpose, have made bold to call in question, if not to reject, the *authority* of the whole. But for what concerns the *matter* of them, and the *wisdom* of the apostle in their application, it must be treated of in the respective places where they occur; when we shall manifest how vain and causeless are the exceptions which have been laid against them, and how singularly they are suited to the proof of those doctrines and assertions in the confirmation whereof they are produced. But the *words* also wherein they are expressed, varying frequently from the *original*, yield some difficulty in their consideration. And this con-

cernment of the apostle's *citations*, to prevent a further trouble in the exposition itself of the several places, may be previously considered. Not that we shall here *explain* and *vindicate* them from the exceptions mentioned, which must of necessity be done afterwards, as occasion offers itself; but we shall only discover in general what respect the apostle's *expressions* have unto the *original* and the old *translations* thereof, and remove some false inferences that have been made on the consideration of them. To this end I shall briefly pass through them all, and compare them with the places whence they are taken.

2. CHAP. I. ver. 5. Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·—"Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." From Ps. ii. 7. The words exactly answer the *original*, with the supply of only the *verb substantive*, whereof in the Hebrew there is almost a perpetual ellipsis, בְּנִי אַתָּא. And the same are the words in the translation of the LXX. In the same verse, Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν·—"I will be unto him a father, and he shall be unto me a son." From 1 Chron. xxii. 10. The LXX. otherwise, as to the *order* of the words, Οὗτος ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν, κἀγὼ αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, which also is the order of the sentences in the *original*, the apostle using his own liberty, and varying from them both; so that this *quotation* is not directly from that *translation*.

Ver. 6. Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ·—"And let all the angels of God worship him." From Ps. xcvii. 7, without change. Only אֱלֹהִים, "gods," is rendered by the apostle ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ, "the angels of God;" of the reason whereof afterwards. The LXX., Προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ,—"Worship him all ye his angels;" differing from the apostle both in form of speech and words. Hence some, not understanding whence this testimony was cited by the apostle, have inserted his words into the Greek Bible, Deut. xxxii. 43, where there is no colour for their introduction, nor any thing in the *original* to answer unto them, whereas the psalmist expressly treateth of the same subject with the apostle; to the reason of which insertion into the Greek version we shall speak afterwards.

Ver. 7. Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα·—"Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." From Ps. civ. 4. The LXX., πῦρ φλέγον, "a flaming fire;" Heb., אֵשׁ לֹהֶט, "fire of flame;" Aquila, πῦρ λάῤῥον, "a vehement fire;" Symmachus, πυρίνην φλόγα, "a fiery flame." Much variety, with little or no difference, as often falls out amongst good translators rendering peculiar Hebraisms, such as this is. The apostle's expression is his own, not borrowed from the LXX.

Ver. 8, 9. Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος (עוֹלָם וָעֶד)· ῥάῤῥδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάῤῥδος τῆς βασιλείας σου· ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε, ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός σου, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου·—"Thy throne, O God, for ever and ever." (The verb

substantive is left out by the apostle, in answer unto the original, כִּסְאֲךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד, and אֱלֹהִים rendered ὁ Θεὸς, for Θεὲ, which the apostrophe requires.) "A sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and thou hast hated iniquity; wherefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The words exactly answer the original, and they are the same in the translation of the LXX.; and whence that coincidence was we shall afterwards inquire. Aquila somewhat otherwise, Ὁ θρονος σου Θεὲ εἰς αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. Symmachus, Αἰώνιος καὶ ἔτι. (עַד came to be translated ἔτι, from likeness of sound.) In Θεὲ, "O God," he expresseth the apostrophe, which is evident in the context. Σκῆπτρον εὐθύτητος, σκῆπτρον βασιλείας σου. שֵׁבֶט he renders by σκῆπτρον, "sceptrum," a sceptre, properly, as we shall see afterwards on Gen. xlix. 10. Ἐμίσησας ἀσέβημα, "Thou hast hated ungodliness," impiety, רָשַׁע. Ἐλαίῳ χαρᾶς, "With the oil of joy," שֶׁמֶן שָׂשׂוֹן. Symmachus, Ἐλαίῳ ἀγλαϊσμοῦ, another word of the same signification with that used by the apostle. From Ps. xlv. 6, 7.

Ver. 10–12. Σὺ κατ' ἀρχὰς, Κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται· καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι·—"And, Thou, O Lord, in the beginning hast founded the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." From Ps. cii. 25–27. And these words of the apostle are now exactly in the Greek Bible. Some little difference there is in them from the Hebrew, the reason whereof we shall afterwards give an account of. Symmachus for ἑλίξεις reads ἀλλάξεις, and so did the copies of the LXX. of old, the word being yet retained in some of them, and reckoned by all amongst the *various readings* of that translation. The word Κύριε, "O Lord," inserted by the apostle, is also undoubtedly taken from hence into the Greek Bible; for as the inserting of it was necessary unto the apostle to denote the person treated of, so it is not in the original, nor will the context of the psalm admit of it; so that it could no otherwise come into that place but from this of the apostle. Nor is it probable that the LXX. would translate תִּחְלִיף, Ἑλίξεις, "Thou shalt roll up," and immediately render יַחֲלֹפוּ, Ἀλλαγήσονται, "They shall be changed." But here also the words have been borrowed from the apostle, whose design was not exactly to translate, but faithfully to apply the sense of the place unto his own purpose.

Ver. 13. Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου·—"Sit thou at my right hand, until I place thine enemies the footstool of thy feet." From Ps. cx. 1. לִימִינִי, "At my right

hand," ἐκ δεξιῶν, in the *plural* number; of the reason of which change and manner of expression we shall treat in its proper place. And here there remains nothing of difference in any *old translation.*

3. CHAP. II. ver. 6–8. Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ· ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτὸν; ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους· δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου· πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ·—"What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou hast made him less for a little while than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory and honour, and hast set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast subjected all things under his feet." From Ps. viii. 4–6. The words of the apostle are the same with those in the present copy of the LXX. Theodotion, Βραχύ τι παρὰ Θεοῦ, מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים, from the ambiguous signification of the word אֱלֹהִים, about which great stirs have been raised; whereof in their proper place. Chrysostom on this text mentions some different translations of the words of the psalm. Ἄλλος, saith he, Τί ὁ κατ' ἄνδρα ὅτι μνημονεύεις αὐτοῦ;—"Another book reads, 'What is he according to man, that thou rememberest him?'" מָה־אֱנוֹשׁ is not Τί ὁ κατ' ἄνδρα, but Τί ἄνθρωπος θνητός; "What is mortal man?" Again, Ἄλλος ἀντὶ τοῦ, Ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτὸν, Ἐπισκέψῃ αὐτόν·—"Another, instead of, 'Thou visitest him,' 'That thou wilt visit him.'" Again, Ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους· ἕτερος, Βραχύ τι παρὰ Θεόν· ἄλλος, Ὀλίγον παρὰ Θεόν,—"Instead of 'Less for a little while than angels;' another, 'A little less than God;' and another, 'Less than God.'" And, he adds, the Hebrew is, Οὐθασρηοῦ μὰτ μὴ ἐλωείμ, וַתַּחְסְּרֵהוּ מְעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים. So different was their pronunciation of the Hebrew from that in use amongst us. Again, he adds, Ἕτερος, Δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ στέψεις αὐτόν,—"Thou shalt crown him with glory and honour;" and yet, ἄλλος, Ἐξουσιάζειν ἐποίησας αὐτόν,—"Thou madest him to have power." From all which variety it is most evident that there were various readings of this context in the ancient copies of the LXX., for no footsteps of them appear in the remains of Aquila, Theodotion, or Symmachus; and that therefore the common reading which is now fixed in the Greek Bible was translated thither from this place of the apostle.

Ver. 12. Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε·—"I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will sing praise unto thee." From Ps. xxii. 22. The LXX., Διαγήσομαι τὸ ὄνομα, אֲסַפְּרָה.

Ver. 13. Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ' αὐτῷ·—"I will put my trust in him." From Ps. xviii. 2. LXX., Ἐλπιῶ ἐπ' αὐτόν·—"I will hope in him." But אֶחֱסֶה־בּוֹ is rightly rendered by the apostle, "I will trust in him." The LXX. have these words of the apostle in Isa. viii. 17, where the words of the original are וְקִוִּיתִי לוֹ,—"And I will wait for him:" so that their words seem to be taken from this place of the

apostle, as apprehending his testimony to be cited from the prophet; which that it is not we shall prove evidently afterwards.

The same verse: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός·—"Behold I and the children which God hath given me." From Isa. viii. 18.

4. CHAP. III. ver. 7–11. Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· οὗ ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με, καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη· διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εἶπον, Ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου· ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου· εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου·—"To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the day of provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years. Wherefore I was grieved with that generation, and said, They do always err in heart; and they have not known my ways. So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest." From Ps. xcv. 7–11. The *translation* of the LXX. agrees with the words of the apostle, both of them answering the *original.* Only, the apostle, clearly to express the reason of God's judgments on that people in the wilderness, distinguisheth the words somewhat otherwise than they are in the Hebrew text. For whereas that saith, "When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works: forty years long was I grieved with that generation;" the apostle adds that season of "forty years" to the mention of their sins, and interposing διό, "wherefore," refers his speech unto the words foregoing, as containing the cause of the ensuing wrath and judgment. And although our present copies of the Greek Bible distinguish the words according to the Hebrew text, yet Theodoret informs us that some copies made the distinction with the apostle, and added διό before προσώχθισα, which also is observed by Nobilius: and this could arise from no other cause but an attempt to insert the very words of the apostle in that text; as did the εἶπον also, reckoned amongst its various lections, though εἶπα remains in the *vulgar editions.*

5. CHAP. IV. ver. 4. Καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ·—"And God rested on the seventh day from all his works." From Gen. ii 2. The apostle adds ὁ Θεὸς to the text, to complete his assertion, and leaves out אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה, ἃ ἐποίησε, "which he had made," as not to his purpose. The LXX., ὧν ἐποίησε, and otherwise also differing from the apostle.

6. CHAP. V. ver. 6. Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ·—"Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." From Ps. cx. 4. So also the LXX., עַל־דִּבְרָתִי, with *jod* superfluous, κατὰ λόγον; *i.e.*, כְּמִנְהַג, *Mos.* There is nothing of variety remaining in these words from any other translations.

7. CHAP. VI. ver. 14. Εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε· —"Blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." From Gen. xxii. 17. The LXX., Πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου,—"I will multiply thy seed."

8. CHAP. VIII. ver. 8–12. Ἰδοὺ, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος (LXX., φησὶ Κύριος), καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν (LXX., διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ διαθήκην καινήν· οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν (LXX., ἣν διεθέμην), ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος· ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου (LXX., διδοὺς δώσω) εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεὸν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν· καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν· ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι·—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws in their minds, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." From Jer. xxxi. 31–34. Instead of τὸν πλησίον, "his neighbour," ver. 11, the LXX. read τὸν πολίτην, "his fellow-*citizen*." But some copies of the LXX. read πλησίον, and some of this text πολίτην; which makes it evident that there hath been tampering, to bring them to *uniformity*. But the greatest difficulty of this quotation ariseth from the agreement of the apostle's words and the translation of the LXX., where both of them seem to depart from the original: for these words in the Hebrew text, ver. 32, אֲשֶׁר־הֵמָּה הֵפֵרוּ אֶת־בְּרִיתִי וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם, "Which my covenant they made void, and I was an husband unto them," or "ruled over them," are rendered by them, Οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, "And they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not." The reason of the apostle's translation of these words we shall manifest and vindicate in our exposition of the context. At present the coincidence of it with that of the LXX., and that in a passage wherein they both seem to differ from

the original, and all translations besides the Syriac and the Arabic, which are made out of it (though the Syriac follows it not in the confused transpositions that are made of Jeremiah's prophecies, from chap. xxv. to chap. xl., as the Arabic doth), is only to be considered; which shall be done so soon as we have recounted the remaining testimonies, whereof some are attended with the same difficulty.

9. CHAP. IX. ver. 20. Τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός·—"This is the blood of the covenant which God hath enjoined unto you." From Exod. xxiv. 8. The sense of the Hebrew text is alluded unto, not the words absolutely. The LXX., Ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, with much difference from the words of the apostle.

10. CHAP. X. ver. 5. Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι·—"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not have, a body thou hast prepared me." From Ps. xl. 6. So also the LXX., both with great difference from the original: for אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִּי, "My ears hast thou digged," or "bored," is rendered, "A body thou hast prepared me." Of the reason of which difference and agreement we shall treat afterwards.

Ver. 6. Ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας·—"In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure." Heb., לֹא שָׁאָלְתָּ, "Thou hast not required." The apostle expresseth exactly the sense of the Holy Ghost, but observes not the first, exact signification of the word. The LXX., ᾔτησας, and in some copies ἐζήτησας, "soughtest not."

Ver. 7. Ἰδοὺ ἥκω (ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ) τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ θέλημά σου·—"Behold, I come (in the head, or beginning, of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God:" that is, Gen. iii. 15. Heb., בְּמְגִלַּת־סֵפֶר;—"In the roll of the book." Symmachus, Ἐν τῷ τεύχει τοῦ ὁρισμοῦ·—"In the volume of thy determination." Aquila, Ἐν τῷ εἰλήματι·—"In the roll." Ἐν τόμῳ·—"In the section." LXX., Τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου ὁ Θεὸς μου ἠβουλήθην·—"I was willing to do thy will, O my God."

Ver 38. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως (LXX., μου) ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ·—"But if any draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." From Hab. ii. 4. The words of the prophet are transposed, and the beginning of the last clause much altered. הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ;—"Behold, it is lifted up, his soul is not right in him." But the sense and intendment of the Holy Ghost is preserved, as shall be manifested.

11. CHAP. XII. ver. 5, 6. Υἱέ μου (μου is not in the LXX.; Heb., בְּנִי, "my son,") μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος· ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος, παιδεύει· (LXX., ἐλέγχει, and in some copies παιδεύει, from this place of the apostle,) μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται·—"My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor

faint when thou art rebuked of him: for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." From Prov. iii. 11, 12. וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יְרָצֶה;—"And as a father the son whom he delighteth in." The sense is retained, but the words not exactly repeated. Aquila, אַל־תִּמְאָס, Μὴ ἀποδοκίμασον, "Reject not," וְאַל־תָּקֹץ, Theodotion, Μηδὲ ἐγκακήσῃς, "Neither vex thyself."

12. CHAP. XIII. ver. 5. Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω·—"I will not leave thee, neither will I forsake thee." From Josh. i. 5. The LXX., in different words, Οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε, οὐδ' ὑπερόψομαι σε·—"I will not leave thee, neither will I despise thee." The apostle's words exactly express the original.

Ver. 6 is from Ps. cxviii. 6, without any difficulty attending it.

13. And these are all the places that are cited, κατὰ ῥητόν, by the apostle in this Epistle out of the Old Testament. Very many others there are, which he either *alludes* unto or *expounds*, that are not of our present consideration. Neither are these here proposed to be *unfolded* as to the sense of them, or as to the removal of the difficulties that the application of them by him is attended withal. This is the proper work of the Exposition of the Epistle intended. All at present aimed at is, to present them in one view, with their agreement and differences from the original and translations, that we may the better judge of his manner of proceeding in the citing of them, and what rule he observed therein. And what in *general* may be concluded from that prospect we have taken of them, I shall offer in the ensuing observations:—

14. First, it is evident that they are exceedingly mistaken who affirm that the apostle cites all his testimonies out of the translation of the LXX., as we intimated is by some pleaded, in the close of the preceding discourse. The words he useth, in very few of them agree exactly with that Greek version of the Old Testament which is now extant,—though apparently, since the writing of this Epistle, it hath grown in its *verbal* conformity unto the allegations as reported in the New; and in most of them he varieth from it, either in the *use of his own liberty*, or in a more exact rendering of the original text. This the first prospect of the places and words compared will evince. Should he have had any respect unto that translation, it were impossible to give any tolerable account whence he should so much differ from it almost in every quotation, as is plain that he doth.

15. It is also undeniably manifest, from this view of his words, that the apostle did not *scrupulously* confine himself unto the precise words either of the original or any translation whatever,—if any other translation, or targum, were then extant besides that of the LXX. Observing and expressing the sense of the testimonies which he thought meet to produce and make use of, he used great liberty,

as did other holy writers of the New Testament, according to the guidance of the Holy Ghost, by whose inspiration he wrote, in expressing them by words of his own. And who shall blame him for so doing? Who should bind him to the rules of quotations, which sometimes necessity, sometimes curiosity, sometimes the cavils of other men, impose upon us in our writings? Herein the apostle used that liberty which the Holy Ghost gave unto him, without the least prejudice unto truth or the faith of the church.

16. Whereas any one of these testimonies, or any part of any one of them, may appear at first view to be *applied* by him unsuitably unto their original importance and intention, we shall manifest not only the contrary to be true against those who have made such exceptions, but also that he makes use of those which were *most proper*, and *cogent*, with respect unto them with whom he had to do. For the apostle in this Epistle, as shall be fully evidenced, disputes upon the acknowledged principles and concessions of the Hebrews. It was then incumbent on him, to make use of such testimonies as were granted, in their church, to belong unto the ends and purposes for which by him they were produced. And that these are such, shall be evinced from their own ancient writings and traditions.

17. The principal difficulty about these citations, lies in those wherein the words of the apostle are the same with those now extant in the Greek Bible, both evidently departing from the original. Three places of this kind are principally vexed by expositors and critics; the first is that of Ps. xl. 7, where the words of the psalmist, in the Hebrew, אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִּי, "My ears hast thou bored" or "digged," are rendered by the apostle, according to the translation of the LXX., Σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι, "But a body hast thou prepared me." That the apostle doth rightly interpret the meaning of the Holy Ghost in the psalm, and in his paraphrase apply the words unto that very end for which they were intended, shall be cleared afterwards. The present difficulty concerns the coincidence of his words with those of the LXX., where apparently they answer not the original. The next is that of the prophet Jeremiah, chap. xxxi. 32, וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם, "And I was an husband unto them," or "I was a lord unto them," or "ruled over them," as the Vulgar Latin renders the words; the apostle, with the LXX., Καὶ ἐγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, "And I regarded them not," or "despised them." The third is that from Hab. ii. 4, הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יָשְׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ, "Behold, it is lifted up, his soul is not right in him;" which words the apostle, with the LXX., render, Καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ·—"But if any draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

18. Concerning these and some other places, many confidently affirm that the apostle waived the original, and reported the words from the translation of the LXX. Cappellus with some others pro-

ceed further, and assign the rise of this difference unto some other copies of the Hebrew text, used by the LXX., varying from those which now remain. Thus, in particular, in that place of Jeremiah before mentioned, he conjectures that for בָּעַלְתִּי they read בָּזַלְתִּי, "I despised them;" as another doth that they read בָּחַלְתִּי to the same purpose: for of such conjectures there is no end. But as בָּעַלְתִּי may well signify as the apostle expounds it, and in other places doth so, as we shall see afterwards, so this boldness in correcting the text, and fancying, without proof, testimony, or probability, of other *ancient* copies of the scripture of the Old Testament, differing in many things from *them* which alone remain, and which indeed were ever in the world, may quickly prove pernicious to the church of God. We must therefore look after another expedient for the removal of this difficulty.

19. I say, then, it is highly probable that the apostle, according to his wonted manner, which appears in almost all the citations used by him in this Epistle, reporting the sense and importance of the places in words of his own, the Christian transcribers of the Greek Bible inserted his expressions into the text; either as judging them a more proper version of the original, whereof they were ignorant, than that of the LXX., or out of a preposterous zeal to take away the appearance of a diversity between the text and the apostle's citation of it. And thus, in those testimonies where there is a real variation from the Hebrew original, the apostle took not his words from the translation of the LXX., but his words were afterwards inserted into that translation. And this, as we have partly made to appear already in sundry instances, so it shall now briefly be further confirmed; for,—

20. First, Whereas the reasons of the apostle for his application of the testimonies used by him in his words and expressions are evident, as shall in particular be made to appear; so no reason can be assigned why the LXX. (if any such LXX. there were) who translated the Old Testament, or any other translators of it, should so render the words of the Hebrew text. Neither various lections, nor ambiguity of signification in the words of the original, can in most of them be pleaded. For instance, the apostle, in applying those words of the psalmist, Ps. xl. 7, אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִּי, unto the human nature and body of Christ, wherein he did the will of God, did certainly express the design and intention of the Holy Ghost in them; but who can imagine what should move the LXX. to render אֹזֶן, a word of a known signification and univocal, by σῶμα, when they had translated it a hundred and fifty times, that is constantly elsewhere, by οὖς and ὠτίον, an "ear," which alone it signifies? or what should move them to render כָּרָה by καταρτίζω, to "prepare," when the word signifies to "dig" or to "bore," and is always so rendered elsewhere by them-

selves? Neither did any such thing come into their minds in the translation of those places whence this expression seems to be borrowed, Exod. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17. When any man, then, can give a tolerable conjecture why the LXX. should be inclined thus to translate these words, I shall consider it. In the meantime, I judge there is much more ground to suppose that the apostle's expressions, which he had weighty cause to use, were by some person inserted into the Greek text of the Old Testament, than that a translation which those that made it had no cause so to do, evidently forsaking the proper meaning of very obvious words, and their sense, known to themselves, should be taken up and used by the apostle unto his purpose.

21. Secondly, It is certain that some words, used by the apostle, have been inserted into some copies of the Greek Bible, which, being single words, and of little importance, prevailed not in them all; as may be seen in sundry of the foregoing instances. And why may we not think that some *whole sentences* might, on the same account, be inserted in some of them, which, being of more importance, found a more general acceptance? And how by other means also that translation was variously changed and corrupted of old, and that before the days of Jerome, learned men do know and confess.

22. It is further evident that *one place*, at least, in this Epistle, which, it may be, some could not conjecture from whence it should be taken, yet finding it urged by the apostle as a testimony out of the Old Testament, is inserted in another place of the text than that from which the apostle took it, and that where there is not the least colour for its insertion. This is the testimony out of Ps. xcvii. 7, which the apostle cites, chap. i. 6, in words much differing from those wherewith the original is rendered by the LXX. This some of the transcribers of the Bible, not knowing well where to find, have inserted, in the very *syllables* of the apostle's expression, into Deut. xxxii. 43; where it yet abides, though originally it had no place there, as we shall, in the exposition of the words, sufficiently manifest. The same and no other is the cause why מִטָּה is rendered ῥάβδος, Gen. xlvii. 31. And may we not as well think, nay, is it not more likely, that they would insert his words into the places from whence they knew his testimonies were taken, with a very little alteration of the *ancient reading*, than that they would wholly *intrude* them into the places from whence they were not taken by him, which yet undeniably hath been done, and that with success? Nay, we find that many things out of the New Testament are translated into the apocryphal books themselves; as, for instance, Ecclus. xxiv. 3, we have these words in the Latin copies, "Ex ore Altissimi prodii primogenita ante omnem creaturam;" which are cited by Bellarmine and others in the confirmation of the deity of Christ, whereas they are taken from Col. i. 15, and are in no Greek copies of that book, [Ecclesiasticus.]

23. Upon these reasons, then,—which may yet be rendered more cogent by many other instances, but that we confine ourselves to this Epistle,—I suppose I may conclude that it is more probable, at least, that the apostle's interpretations of the testimonies used by him, all agreeably unto the mind of the Holy Ghost, were by some of old inserted into the vulgar copies of the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and therein prevailed unto *common acceptation*, than that he himself followed, in the citation of them, a translation departing without reason from the original text, and diverting unto such senses as its authors knew not to be contained in them, which must needs give offence unto them with whom he had to do. It appears, then, that from hence no light can be given unto our inquiry after the language wherein this Epistle was originally written, though it be clear enough upon other considerations

---

SUBSIDIARY NOTE ON EXERCITATION V.

BY THE EDITOR.

Dr Owen is anxious to make it appear that "very few" of the quotations from the Old Testament in this Epistle agree with the Septuagint, and that in those instances where an agreement obtains between them, the Greek renderings of Paul in the Epistle may have been subsequently inserted in copies of that version. In neither of these conclusions is he sustained by the voice of modern criticism. As the subject is of some importance, we submit the views of three modern writers, who have devoted special attention to it.

Stuart classifies the quotations of the Epistle under the following divisions:—

"1. There are many exact coincidences between the Septuagint and Hebrew and the quotations in our Epistle, in almost every minute word." Of this class he gives fourteen instances:—Heb. i. 5; i. 10, *seq.*; i. 12; ii. 6, *seq.*; ii. 12; ii. 13; iii. 7, *seq.*; iii. 15; iv. 3; iv. 7; v. 5; v. 6; vii. 17, 21; xiii. 6.

"2. In a considerable number of cases there is nearly an exact coincidence with the Septuagint and Hebrew, yet with some slight verbal differences." Of this class he gives seven instances:—Heb. i. 6; iv. 4; viii. 5; viii. 8; ix. 20; x. 16, 17; x. 37, 38.

"3. There is a number of cases in which there is a little discrepancy in diction from the Septuagint, where it agrees with the Hebrew." Of this class he gives six instances:—Heb. i. 7; i. 8, 9; xii. 26; vi. 14; xii. 20; xii. 21.

"4. There is an accordance in several cases with the Septuagint, where it differs from the Hebrew,"—*e.g.*, Heb. x. 5, *seq.*; xi. 21; xii. 6; xiii. 5.

Tholuck remarks of this Epistle, that "its citations are unequally close, and in the longer passages agree quite verbally with the Septuagint. The citation in chap. x. 30 is the only one that forms an exception. Our Epistle, also, in two important passages, ch. x. 5 and ch. ii. 7, has followed the Greek version closely, although, according to our existing text, it is essentially defective; as similar errors of translation may be also adduced, ch. xi. 21, ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου, and ch. xiii. 15, καρπὸν χειλέων." We cannot admit, what Tholuck asserts, that the author of our Epistle has been led either to an erroneous translation, or to an application not corresponding to the Old Testament text. Tholuck himself acknowledges the substantial accuracy of the readings in ch. x. 5 and ch. xiii. 15. It is questionable if the last instance is a quotation at all. It is held by some to be taken from Hosea xiv. 3, by reading פְּרִי instead of פָּרִים, "fruit" instead of "calves." But if it be derived from any source, it is as probable that Prov xviii. 20, פְּרִי פִי, supplied the matrix of the expression. In regard to ch. ii. 7, the clause in which it follows the Septuagint, in opposition to the Hebrew, is now omitted, on such critical authority as Griesbach, Scholz, Knapp, Lachmann, and Tischendorf. Nor is Tholuck warranted to speak of the phrase in ch. xi. 21 as a mistranslation borrowed from the Septuagint. The question depends upon the vowel-pointing of the He-

brew in Gen. xlvii. 31, whether it should be מַטֶּה, "staff," or הַמִּטָּה, "bed." Stuart has no hesitation in preferring the former, in which case there would be no mistranslation; and it is more reasonable to suppose an error in punctuation, which might be a mistake of the transcriber, than an error of translation in an inspired epistle.

Davidson thus expresses himself on the subject of these citations:—"In the Epistle to the Hebrews the Septuagint is everywhere quoted, irrespective of the fact whether the version gives the sense or not. Departures from the Greek are trifling. . . . In short, the writer never consulted the Hebrew. There is but one exception to this, namely, ch. x. 30. . . . . It must be maintained that in ch. x. 30 the writer of the present Epistle goes to the Hebrew, departing from the Septuagint."

The citation in ch. x. 30 really suggests the most decisive results. The passage is in harmony with the Hebrew; it varies completely from the Septuagint. Moreover, on comparison with Rom. xii. 19, where the same quotation from Deut. xxxii. 35, 36, occurs, the same translation which is given in ch. x. 30 is found, with the important addition in both instances of λέγει Κύριος. The epistles in which a translation so curiously identical occurs must have emanated from the same author. Moreover, he must have availed himself of the Greek version already in existence as freely as he could, since the Hebrew original was comparatively of limited circulation in his day, and only departed from it under the pressure of an absolute necessity. The inspiration that guided him to this course ratified the propriety of translating the Scriptures into all the vernacular tongues of the world.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE,

ON THE QUESTION TO WHOM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS WAS WRITTEN.

No better place than the present occurs for reference to this point, on which there has been considerable discussion since the days of Owen. The various opinions respecting it may be reduced to four:—1. That it was written to Gentile Christians; 2. To Jewish believers out of Palestine; 3. To Jewish believers in Palestine; and, 4. To Jewish believers in Palestine, but more especially in Jerusalem or Cæsarea.

1. Roeth believes it to have been sent to the church at Ephesus; Baumgarten Crusius, to the joint church of the Ephesians and Colossians.

2. Under the second class, Jewish believers generally, or in Asia Minor, or Spain, or Rome, or Alexandria, or elsewhere, have been named as the parties to whom it was addressed.

3. The authorities in favour of the third view are numerous, consisting of the great majority both of the ancient fathers and modern critics. The reasons for this opinion are,—(1.) *The weight of ancient authority;* for it is supported by the testimony of Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and the great body of the fathers. (2.) *The inscription* which the Epistle bears,—Πρὸς Ἑβραίους. Credner and Bleek regard this title or inscription as proceeding from the author of the Epistle; and though this view should be rejected, the antiquity of the inscription is beyond doubt, as it was known to the fathers of the second century, and appears in such ancient versions as the Vetus Itala, and the Peshito. The word Ἑβραίους is, however, of uncertain application, denoting, according to New Testament usage, either Hebrews by religion and nation, as in Phil. iii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 22, or the Jews of Palestine who used the Aramæan language, in opposition to the Hellenists,—Jews born out of Palestine, and using chiefly the Greek language, as in Acts vi. 1. The analogy of the title of an early Gospel, whether a separate Gospel or an Aramæan original of Matthew's Gospel, Εὐαγγέλιον κατ' Ἑβραίους, is conceived to fix the meaning of the term in the latter sense, as it is used in the inscription to the Epistle. (3.) *The general tenor of the Epistle*, as it contains no allusions to any previous heathenism on the part of those to whom it was addressed, and no discussion of the points on which controversy at one time prevailed between the Gentile and Jewish Christians; it presupposes familiar knowledge of the rites and services of the temple on the part of its readers, and warns them against the temptation to which they were specially exposed,—apostasy to Judaism, in consequence of the powerful hold which the Levitical worship, in daily observance before them, had upon their earliest associations. (4.) *Particular references* which occur in the Epistle. In ch. xiii. 12, "Without the gate" is a phrase which a Jew resident in Palestine could alone fully understand; in ch. x. 32–34, the persecution alluded to accords with what we know of the sufferings of the primitive Christians in Jerusalem; in ch. ix. 5, "It is not necessary," seems to imply a local and personal acquaintance which the readers were presumed to possess of the objects to which reference is made.

The main objection to this view rests on an alleged discrepancy between ch. xii. 4. and Acts viii. 1–3, and xii. 1. It is said that those to whom the Epistle was sent had "not yet resisted unto blood," while both Stephen and James had suffered martyrdom. The persecution in which these saints fell happened in A.D. 38, and A.D. 44. Before the Epistle was written, there was time for another generation to arise, to whom the language might apply with sufficient accuracy, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood."

4. Moses Stuart assigns reasons for supposing *Cæsarea* to have been the place where the church of Jewish converts existed to whom the Epistle was sent. Paul was not its first teacher, and no such claim is urged in the Epistle. He had many opportunities for becoming acquainted with the Christians there, Acts ix. 30, xviii. 22, xxi. 8–13, xxiv. 23, 27. The city was inhabited by rich Jews, who, if converted, might have become liable to spoliation, Heb. x. 34. Grecian games were celebrated in this city, and hence such allusions as occur in ch. x. 32, xii. 1. Timothy is mentioned in the Epistle, and Timothy was with Paul at Cæsarea. Cæsarea was but two days' journey from Jerusalem, and the Jews residing in it could understand the temple-service as clearly as the inhabitants of Jerusalem themselves.

Dr Davidson argues that the church in Cæsarea would in all probability have a large proportion of Gentile converts, and it is certain that the first convert in Cæsarea was Cornelius, a Gentile proselyte, Acts x. He inclines to the opinion that *Jerusalem* was the church which first received the Epistle.

EXERCITATION VI.

ONENESS OF THE CHURCH.

1. Oneness of the church—Mistake of the Jews about the nature of the promises. 2. Promise of the Messiah the foundation of the church; but as including the covenant. 3. The church confined unto the person and posterity of Abraham—His call and separation for a double end. 4. Who properly the seed of Abraham. 5. Mistake of the Jews about the covenant. 6. Abraham the father of the faithful and heir of the world, on what account. 7. The church still the same.

1. THE Jews at the time of writing this Epistle (and their posterity in all succeeding generations follow their example and tradition) were not a little confirmed in their obstinacy and unbelief by a misapprehension of the true sense and nature of the *promises* of the Old Testament; for whereas they found many glorious promises made unto the church in the days of the Messiah, especially concerning the great access of the Gentiles unto it, they looked upon themselves, the posterity of Abraham, on the account of their being his children according to the flesh, as the first, proper, and indeed *only* subject of them; unto whom, in their accomplishment, others were to be proselyted and joined, the substance and foundation of the church remaining still with them. But the event answered not their expectation. Instead of inheriting all the promises merely upon their *carnal* interest and privilege,—which they looked for, and continue so to do unto this day,—they found that themselves must come in on a *new account*, to be sharers in them in common with others, or be rejected whilst those others were admitted unto the inheritance. This filled them with wrath and envy; which greatly

added to the strengthening of their unbelief. They could not bear with patience an intimation of letting out the vineyard to other husbandmen. With this principle and prejudice of theirs the apostle dealt directly in his Epistle to the Romans, chap. ix.–xi.

On the same grounds he proceedeth with them in this Epistle; and because his answer to their objection from the promises lies at the foundation of many of his reasonings with them, the nature of it must be here previously explained. Not that I shall here enter into a consideration of the Jews' argument to prove the Messiah not yet to be come, because the promises in their sense of them are not yet accomplished, which shall be fully removed in the close of these discourses; but only, as I said, open the nature in general of that answer which our apostle returns unto them, and builds his reasonings with them upon.

2. We shall have occasion afterwards at large to show how, after the entrance of sin, God founded his church in the promise of the Messiah given unto Adam. Now, though that promise was the supportment and encouragement of mankind to seek the Lord,—a promise, absolutely considered, proceeding from mere grace and mercy, —yet, as it was the foundation of the church, it included in it the nature of a covenant, virtually requiring a restipulation unto obedience in them who by faith come to have an interest therein. And this the nature of the thing itself required; for the promise was given unto this end and purpose, that men might have a new bottom and foundation of obedience, that of the first covenant being disannulled. Hence, in the following explications of the promise, this condition of obedience is expressly added. So upon its renewal unto Abraham, God required that he should "walk before him, and be upright." This promise, then, as it hath the nature of a covenant, including the grace that God would show unto sinners in the Messiah, and the obedience that he required from them, was, from the first giving of it, the foundation of the church, and the whole worship of God therein.

Unto this church, so founded and built on this covenant, and by the means thereof on the redeeming mediatory Seed promised therein, were all the following promises and the privileges exhibited in them given and annexed. Neither hath, or ever had, any individual person any spiritual right unto, or interest in, any of those promises or privileges, whatever his outward condition were, but only by virtue of his membership in the church built on the covenant, whereunto, as we said, they do all appertain. On this account the church before the days of Abraham, though scattered up and down in the world, and subject unto many changes in its worship by the addition of new revelations, was still but one and the same, because founded in the same covenant, and interested thereby in all the

benefits or privileges that God had given or granted, or would do so at any time, unto his church.

3. In process of time, God was pleased to confine this church, as unto the *ordinary* visible dispensation of his grace, unto the person and posterity of Abraham. Upon this restriction of the church covenant and promise, the Jews of old managed a plea in their own justification against the doctrine of the Lord Christ and his apostles. "We are the children, the seed of Abraham," was their continual cry; on the account whereof they presumed that all the promises belonged unto them, and upon the matter unto them alone. And this their persuasion hath cast them, as we shall see, upon a woful and fatal mistake. Two privileges did God grant unto Abraham, upon his separation to a special interest in the old promise and covenant:—

First, That according to the flesh he should be *the father of the Messiah*, the promised seed; who was the very life of the covenant, the fountain and cause of all the blessings contained in it. That this privilege was *temporary*, having a limited season, time, and end, appointed unto it, the very nature of the thing itself doth demonstrate; for upon this actual exhibition in the *flesh*, it was to cease. In pursuit hereof were his posterity separated from the rest of the world, and preserved a peculiar people, that through them the promised Seed might be brought forth in the fulness of time, and be of them according unto the flesh, Rom. ix. 5.

Secondly, Together with this, he had also another *privilege* granted unto him, namely, that his faith, whereby he was personally interested in the covenant, should be the *pattern of the faith of the church* in all generations; and that none should ever come to be a member of it, or a sharer in its blessings, but by the same faith that he had fixed on the *Seed* that was in the promise, to be brought forth from him into the world. On the account of this privilege, he became the father of all them that do believe: for "they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham," Gal. iii. 7, Rom. iv. 11: as also "heir of the world," Rom. iv. 13, in that all that should believe throughout the world, being thereby implanted into the covenant made with him, should become his "spiritual children."

4. Answerably unto this twofold end of the separation of Abraham, there was a double seed allotted unto him;—*a seed according to the flesh*, separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah according unto the flesh; and *a seed according to the promise*, that is, such as by faith should have interest in the promise, or all the elect of God. Not that these two seeds were always *subjectively* diverse, so that the seed separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah in the flesh should neither in whole nor in part be also the seed according to the promise; or, on the contrary, that the seed according to the promise should none of it be his seed after the flesh. Our apostle

declares the contrary in the instances of Isaac and Jacob, with the "remnant" of Israel that shall be saved, Rom. ix., x., xi. But sometimes the same seed came under diverse considerations, being the seed of Abraham both according to the flesh and according to the promise; and sometimes the seed itself was diverse, those according to the flesh being not of the promise, and so on the contrary. Thus Isaac and Jacob were the seed of Abraham according unto the flesh, separated unto the bringing forth of the Messiah after the flesh, because they were his carnal posterity; and they were also of the seed of the promise, because, by their own personal faith, they were interested in the covenant of Abraham their father. Multitudes afterwards were of the carnal seed of Abraham, and of the number of the people separated to bring forth the Messiah in the flesh, and yet were not of the seed according to the promise, nor interested in the spiritual blessings of the covenant; because they did not personally believe, as our apostle declares, chap. iv. of this epistle. And many, afterwards, who were not of the *carnal seed* of Abraham, nor interested in the privilege of bringing forth the Messiah in the flesh, were yet designed to be made his *spiritual seed* by faith; that in them he might become "heir of the world," and all nations of the earth be blessed in him. Now, it is evident that it is the second privilege, or spiritual seed, wherein the church, to whom the promises are made, is founded, and whereof it doth consist,—namely, in them who by faith are interested in the covenant of Abraham, whether they be of the carnal seed or no.

5. And herein lay the great mistake of the Jews of old, wherein they are followed by their posterity unto this day. They thought no more was needful to interest them in the covenant of Abraham but that they were his seed according to the flesh; and they constantly pleaded the latter privilege as the ground and reason of the former. It is true, they were the children of Abraham according to the flesh: but on that account they can have no other privilege than Abraham had in the flesh himself; and this was, as we have showed, that he should be set apart as a special channel, through whose loins God would derive the promised Seed into the world. In like manner were they separated to be a peculiar people, as his posterity, from amongst whom He should be so brought forth.

That this *separation* and privilege was to cease when the end of it was accomplished and the Messiah exhibited, the very nature of the thing declares; for to what purpose should it be continued when that was fully effected whereunto it was designed? But they would extend this privilege, and mix it with the other, contending that, because they were the children of Abraham according to the flesh, the whole blessing and covenant of Abraham belonged unto them. But as our Saviour proved that in the latter sense they were

not the children of Abraham, because they did not the works of Abraham; so our apostle plainly demonstrates, Rom. iv. ix. x. xi., Gal. iii. iv., that those of them who had not the faith of Abraham had no interest in his blessing and covenant. Seeing, therefore, that their other privilege was come to an end, with all the carnal ordinances that attended it, by the actual coming of the Messiah, whereunto they were subservient, if they did not, by faith in the promised seed, attain an interest in this of the spiritual blessing, it is evident that they could on no account be considered as actual sharers in the covenant of God.

6. We have seen that Abraham, on the account of his *faith*, and not of his separation according to the *flesh*, was the father of all that believe, and heir of the world. And in the covenant made with him, as to that which concerns, not the bringing forth of the promised Seed according to the flesh, but as unto faith therein, and in the work of redemption to be performed thereby, lies the foundation of the church in all ages. Wheresoever this covenant is, and with whomsoever it is established, with them is the church; unto whom all the promises and privileges of the church do belong. Hence it was, that at the coming of the Messiah there was not one church taken away, and another set up in the room thereof; but the church continued the same, in those that were the children of Abraham according to the faith. The Christian church is not *another* church, but the very *same* that was before the coming of Christ, having the same faith with it, and interested in the same covenant.

It is true, the former carnal privilege of Abraham and his posterity expiring, on the grounds before mentioned, *the ordinances of worship* which were suited thereunto did necessarily cease also. And this cast the Jews into great perplexities, and proved the last trial that God made of them; for whereas both these,—namely, the carnal and spiritual privileges of Abraham's covenant,—had been carried on together in a mixed way for many generations, coming now to be separated, and a trial to be made (Mal. iii.) who of the Jews had interest in both, who in one only, those who had only the carnal privilege, of being children of Abraham according to the flesh, contended for a share on that single account in the other also,—that is, in all the promises annexed unto the covenant. But the foundation of their plea was taken away, and the church, unto which the promises belong, remained with them that were heirs of Abraham's faith only.

7. It remains, then, that the church founded in the covenant, and unto which all the promises did and do belong, abode at the coming of Christ, and doth abide ever since, in and among those who are the children of Abraham by faith. The *old church* was not *taken*

away, and a *new one set up*, but the same church was continued, only in those who by faith inherited the promises. Great alterations, indeed, were then made in the outward state and condition of the church; as,—(1.) The carnal privilege of the Jews, in their separation to bring forth the Messiah, then failed; and therewith their claim on that account to be the children of Abraham. (2.) The ordinances of worship suited unto that privilege expired and came to an end. (3.) New ordinances of worship were appointed, suited unto the new light and grace then granted unto the church. (4.) The Gentiles came in to the faith of Abraham together with the Jews, to be fellow-heirs with them in his blessing. But none of these, nor all of them together, made any such alteration *in* the church but that it was still *one* and the *same*. The olive-tree was the same, only some branches were broken off, and others planted in; the Jews fell, and the Gentiles came in their room.

And this doth and must determine the difference between the Jews and Christians about the *promises* of the Old Testament. They are all made unto *the church*. No individual person hath any interest in them but by virtue of his *membership* therewith. This church is, and always was, one and the same. With whomsoever it remains, the *promises* are theirs; and that not by implication or *analogy*, but directly and properly. They belong as immediately, at this day, either to the Jews or Christians, as they did of old to any. The question is, *With whom is this church*, founded on the *promised Seed* in the covenant? This is Zion, Jerusalem, Israel, Jacob, the temple of God. The Jews plead that it is with them, because they are the children of Abraham according to the flesh. Christians tell them that their privilege on this account was of another nature, and ended with the coming of the Messiah; that the church unto whom all the promises belong are only those who are heirs of Abraham's faith, believing as he did, and thereby interested in his covenant. Not as though the promise made to Abraham were of none effect; for as it was made good unto his *carnal seed* in the exhibition of the Messiah, so the spiritual privileges of it belonged only unto those of the Jews and Gentiles in whom God had graciously purposed to effect the faith of Abraham. Thus was and is the church, whereunto all the promises belong, still one and the same, namely, Abraham's children according to the faith: and among those promises this is one, that God will be a God unto them and their seed for ever.

EXERCITATION VII.

OF THE JUDAICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1–4. Of the Judaical distribution of the Old Testament. 5–11. The original and nature of their oral law and traditions. 12–14. The whole disproved. 15–20. Agreement of the Jews and Papists about traditions, instanced in sundry particulars.

1. THE apostle, dealing with the Hebrews about the revelation of the will of God made unto their fathers, assigns it in general unto his speaking unto them "in the prophets," chap. i. 1. This *speaking* unto them, the present Jews affirm to consist of two parts:—(1.) That which Moses and the following prophets were commanded to *write* for the public use of the church; (2.) What, being delivered only by *word of mouth* unto Moses, and continued by oral tradition until after the last destruction of the temple, was afterwards committed unto writing. And because those who would read our Exposition of this Epistle, or the Epistle itself, with profit, had need of some insight into the opinions and traditions of the Jews about these things, I shall, for the sake of them that want either *skill* or *leisure* to search after them elsewhere, give a brief account of their faith concerning the two heads of revelation mentioned, and therein discover both the principal means and nature of their present apostasy and infidelity.

2. The Scripture of the Old Testament they call מִקְרָא, and divide it into three parts:—(1.) הַתּוֹרָה, "The Law;" (2.) נְבִיאִים, "The Prophets;" (3.) כְּתוּבִים, "The Writings by divine Inspiration," which are usually called the "Hagiographa," or holy writings. And this distribution of the books of the Old Testament is in general intimated by our Saviour, Luke xxiv. 44, Πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ Νόμῳ Μωσέως, καὶ Προφήταις, καὶ Ψαλμοῖς·—"All things written in the Law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms;" under which last head all the *poetical* books of the Scripture are contained. Thus Rabbi Bechai, in Cad Hakkemach: התורה שלשה חלקים תורה נביאים כתובים;—"The Law" (so sometimes they call the whole volume) "is divided into three parts, the Law, the Prophets, and the Holy Writings." All are comprised generally under the name of the Law; for so they say in Midrash Tehillim, Ps. lxxviii. 1, מזמורים תורה והנביאים תורה;—"The Psalms are the Law, and the Prophets are the Law;" that is, the whole Scripture.

This distribution, so far as it is intimated in the words of our Saviour, doth evidently arise from the *nature* and *subject-matter* of the books themselves. And this was the received division of the books of the Old Testament whilst the Judaical church stood and continued; but the post-Talmudical doctors, overlooking or neglecting

the true reason of this distribution, have fancied others, taken from the *different manners and degrees of revelation* by which they were given out unto the church. Amongst these they make the revelation to Moses the most excellent, and are very vain in counting the privileges and pre-eminences it had above all others; which are elsewhere examined. In the next degree they place those which proceeded from the *spirit of prophecy*, which they distinguish from the *inspiration of the Holy Ghost;* yea, in the *eleven* degrees of divine revelation assigned by Maimonides, More Nebuch., par. ii., that by *inspiration* is cast into the last and lowest place! But this distinction is groundless, and merely fancied out of the various ways that God was pleased to use in representing things to the minds of the prophets, when it was, in them all, the *inspiration of the Holy Ghost* alone that enabled them infallibly to declare the mind of God unto the church, 2 Pet. i. 21.

Now, the books thus given by the spirit of prophecy, [in the second degree,] they make of two sorts:—(1.) נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים, "The former Prophets," which are all the *historical* books of the Old Testament written before the captivity, as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Ruth only excepted. (2.) נְבִיאִים אַחֲרוֹנִים, ["The latter Prophets,"] which are all the *prophetical* books, peculiarly so called, Daniel only excepted,—that is, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets. Of the last *sort*, or כְּתוּבִים, "Kethubim," books written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are the poetical books of the Scripture,—Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, Lamentations, with Ecclesiastes; whereunto they add Ruth, Daniel, and the historical books written after the captivity, as the Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; which make up the canon of the Old Testament. Why sundry of these books should be cast into the last sort, as the story of Ruth and the prophecy of Daniel, they can give no tolerable account. The other books also written after the captivity are plainly of the same nature with those which they call "The former Prophets;" and as for that of Daniel, it contains in it almost all the eminent kinds of revelation whereby themselves would distinguish the spirit of prophecy from the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Neither have they any reason for this distribution; but, finding the general division before mentioned to have been received in the church of old, they have disposed of the particular books into their orders at their pleasure; casting Daniel, as is probable, into their last order, because so many of his visions and prophecies relate unto other nations besides their own.

The Law, or the books of Moses, they call חוּמָשׁ, or the Pentateuch, from the number of the books; or חֲמִשָּׁה חוּמְשֵׁי תּוֹרָה, "The fives," or "The five parts of the Law;" whereunto Jerome, in his epistle to Paulinus, wrests those words of the apostle, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, "I had

rather speak πέντε λόγους, five words, in the church," as if he had respect to the Law of Moses.

These five books they divide into paraschæ, or sections, whereof they read one each Sabbath-day in their synagogues;—Genesis into 12, Exodus into 11, Leviticus into 10, Numbers into 10, Deuteronomy into 10,—which all make 53; whereby, reading one each day, and two in one day, they read through the whole in the course of a year, beginning at the feast of tabernacles. And this they did of old, as James testifies, Acts xv. 21, "Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day." Some of them make 54 of these sections, dividing the last section of Genesis into two, beginning the latter at chap. xlvii. 28, constituting the following chapters a distinct section, though it have not the usual note of them prefixed unto it, but only one single *samech;* to note, as they say, its being absolutely closed or shut up, on the account of the prophecy of the coming of the Messiah, chap. xlix., whose season is unknown to them.

3. They also divide it into lesser sections, and those of two sorts, *open* and *close*, which have their distinct marks in their Bibles; and many superstitious observations they have about the beginning and ending of them. Of the first sort there are in Genesis 43, of the latter 48; in Exodus, of the first sort 69, of the latter 95; in Leviticus, of the first sort 52, of the latter 46; in Numbers, of the first 92, of the latter 66; in Deuteronomy, of the first sort 34, of the latter 379;—in all 634. Besides, they observe the number of the verses at the end of every book; as also that ו in גָּחוֹן, Lev. xi. 42, is the middle letter of the Law; דָּרַשׁ, Lev. x. 16, the middle word; Lev. xiii. 33 the middle verse; the number of all which through the Law is 23,206.

Moreover, they divide the Law, or five books of Moses, into 53 סְדָרִים, "sedarim," or distinctions, whereof Genesis contains 42, Exodus 29, Leviticus 23, Numbers 32, Deuteronomy 27; which kind of distinctions they also observe throughout the Scripture, assigning unto Joshua 14, Judges 14, Samuel 34, Kings 35, Isaiah 26, Jeremiah 31, Ezekiel 29, the lesser Prophets 21, Psalms 19, Job 8, Proverbs 8, Ecclesiastes 4, Canticles and Lamentations are not divided, Daniel 7, Esther 7, Ezra and Nehemiah 10, Chronicles 25.

Besides, they distribute the Prophets into sections called הַפְטָרוֹת "haphters," that answer the sections which are read every Sabbath-day in their synagogues; and this division of the Prophets they affirm to have been made in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, whom they call הָרָשָׁע, "that wicked one," when the reading of the Law was prohibited unto them. All which things are handled at large by others.

4. Having for a long season lost the promise of the Spirit, and therewith all saving spiritual knowledge of the mind and will of

God in the Scripture, the best of their employment about it hath been in reference to the words and letters of it; wherein their diligence hath been of use in the preservation of the copies of it entire and free from corruption: for after that the canon of the Old Testament was completed in the days of Ezra, and points or vowels added to the letters, to preserve the knowledge of the tongue and facilitate the right reading and learning of it, it is incredible what industry, diligence, and curiosity, they have used in and about the letter of the whole Scripture. The collection of their pains and observations to this purpose is called the Masora or Masoreth; consisting in critical observations upon the words and letters of the Scripture, begun to be collected of old, even it may be from the days of Ezra, and continued until the time of composing the Talmud, with some additional observations since annexed unto it.

The writers, composers, and gatherers of this work, they call בעלי המסורה; whose principal observations were gathered and published by Rabbi Jacob Chaiim, and annexed to the Venetian Bibles; whereas, before, the Masora was written in other books innumerable. In this, their critical doctrine, they give us the number of the verses of the Scripture, as also how often every word is used in the whole, and with what variety as to letters and vowels; what is the whole number of all the letters in the Bible, and how often each letter is severally used; with innumerable other useful observations: the sum whereof is gathered by Buxtorf in his excellent treatise on that subject. And hereby is the knowledge of their masters bounded; they go not beyond the letter, but are more blind than moles in the spiritual sense of it. And thus they continue an example of the righteous judgment of God, in giving them up to the counsels of their own hearts; and an evident instance how unable the letter of the Scripture is to furnish men with the saving knowledge of the will of God, who enjoy not the Spirit promised in the same covenant to the church of the elect, Isa. lix. 21.

5. Unto that ignorance of the mind of God in the Scripture which is spread over them, they have added another prejudice against the truth, in a strange figment of an *oral law*, which they make equal unto, yea in many things prefer before, that which is written. The Scripture becoming a lifeless letter unto them, the true understanding of the mind of God being utterly departed and hid from them, it was impossible that they should rest therein, or content themselves with what is revealed by it. For as the word, whilst it is enjoyed and used according to the mind of God, and is accompanied with that Spirit which is promised to lead them that believe into all truth, is full of sweetness and life to the souls of men, a perfect rule of walking before God, and that which satiates them with wisdom and knowledge; so when it is enjoyed merely on an outward account

as such a writing, without any dispensation of suitable light and grace, it will yield men no satisfaction; which makes them constantly turn aside to other means and ways of knowing and serving God. This being so eminent in the Jews, and the medium they have fixed on to supply that want which they suppose to be in the Scripture, but is indeed in themselves, proving to be the great engine of their hardening and obstinacy in their infidelity, I shall first declare what it is that they intend by the *oral law*, and then show the *absurdity and falseness of their pretensions about it;* though it must not be denied that it is one of the most ancient fables that is credited amongst any of the sons of men at this day in the world.

6. This oral law they affirm to be an *unwritten tradition* and exposition of the written law of Moses, given unto him in Mount Sinai, and committed by him to Joshua and the sanhedrim, to be by them delivered over by oral tradition unto those who should succeed them in the government of that church. It doth not appear that, in the days of Christ or his apostles, whilst the temple was standing, there was any stated opinion amongst them about this oral law; though it is evident that, not long after, it began to be received by the body of the people. Nay, it is evident that there was no such law then acknowledged; for the Sadducees, who utterly reject all the main principles of it, were then not only tolerated, but also in chief rule, one of them being high priest.

That they had multiplied many superstitious observances amongst them, under the name of "traditions," is most clear in the Gospel; and it doth not appear that then they knew whom to assign their original unto, and therefore indefinitely called them "The traditions of the elders," or those that lived of old before them. After the destruction of their temple, when they had lost the life and spirit of that worship which the Scripture revealed, betaking themselves wholly unto their traditional figments, they began to bethink themselves how they might give countenance to their apostasy from the perfection and doctrine of the written law. For this end they began to fancy that these traditions were no less from God than the written law itself. For when Moses was forty days and forty nights in the mountain, they say that, in the *day time*, he wrote the law from the mouth of God; and in the *night*, God instructed him in the oral law, or unwritten exposition of it, which they have received by tradition from him. For when he came down from the mount, after he had read unto them the written law, as they say, he repeated to Aaron, and Eleazar, and the sanhedrim, all that secret instruction which he had received in the night from God, which it was not lawful for him to write: but in especial he committed the whole to Joshua; Joshua did the same to Eleazar, as he did to his son Phinehas; after whom they give us a catalogue of several prophets that lived in the ensuing gene-

rations, all whom they employ in this service of conveying down the oral law to their successors. Unto the high priests also they give a place in this work; of whom there were eighty-three from the first institution of that office to the destruction of the temple, Joseph. lib. xx. cap. x. From Aaron to the building of Solomon's temple thirteen; from thence to the captivity eighteen; all the rest take up the troublesome time of the apostasy of their church, unto the final ruin of it, their "rulers being many because of their wickedness," as themselves observe.

The last person whom they would have to preserve the oral law absolutely pure was that Simeon whom they call הצדיק, "The just," mentioned by Jesus the son of Sirach, chap. l. And it is very observable that the later Jews have left out Simeon the son of Hillel, whom their ancient masters placed upon the roll of the preservers of this treasure, supposing he might be that Simeon who in his old age received our Saviour in his arms when he was presented in the temple, Luke ii. 25,—a crime sufficient, among the Jews, to brand him with a perpetual ignominy; neither are they alone in turning men's glory into reproach and shame.

7. After the destruction of the temple and city, when the *evil husbandmen* were slain, and the vineyard of the Lord let out to others, the kingdom given to another nation, and therewith the covenant-sanctified use of the Scripture, the remaining Jews, having lost wholly the mind of God therein, betook themselves to their *traditions*, and, as I said before, began to fancy and contend that they came from God himself; whereas their predecessors durst not plead any thing for them but that they came unto them from "them of old,"—that is, some of the masters of preceding generations. Hereupon a while after, [A.D. 190,] (as I have elsewhere showed at large,) one of them, whom they call Rabbi Judah Hannasi, and Hakkadosh, the "prince," and the "holy," took upon him to gather their *scattered traditions*, and to cast them into form, order, and method in writing, that they might be unto the Jews a rule of life and worship for ever. The story of his work and undertaking is given us by Maimonides in Jad Chazachah, the authors of Seder Olam, Halicoth Olam, Tzemach David, and many others; and they all agree that this their great master lived about the times of Marcus Antoninus, two hundred years or thereabouts after the destruction of city and temple.

8. This collection of his they call מִשְׁנָה or מִשְׁנַיּוֹת, "Mishnah" or "Mishnaioth," being, as is pretended, a *repetition of the law* in an exposition of it; indeed, a *farrago* of all sorts of traditions, true and false, with a monstrous mixture of lies, useless, foolish, and wicked. The things contained in it are, by themselves, referred to five heads: —(1.) The *oral law*, received by Moses on Mount Sinai, and preserved by the means before declared; (2.) *Oral constitutions* of Moses

himself, after he came down from the mount; (3.) *Constitutions and orders*, drawn, by various ways of arguing (thirteen, as Rambam tells us), out of the written law; (4.) The *answers and decrees* of the sanhedrim and other wise men in former ages; (5.) *Immemorial customs*, whose original being unknown are supposed to be divine.

9. The whole is divided into six parts, noted with the initial letter of the word which signifies the chief things treated on in it. As the first by ז, *z;* that is, זרעים, "zeraim," "seeds;" which is divided into eleven "massicktot" or treatises, containing all of them seventy-five chapters. The second by מ, *m;* that is, מועד, "moad," or "appointed feasts;" which is distributed into twelve "massicktot," containing in them eighty-eight chapters. The third by נ, that is, נשים, "of women;" and is distributed into seven treatises, containing seventy-one chapters. The fourth by נ, that is, נזיקים, "nezikim," about "loss and damage;" and is divided into eight "massicktot," whereof the first is divided into three parts, called בבא מציעא, בבא קמא, בבא בתרא, "the first, middle, and last port," or entrance; containing in them thirty chapters, whereunto forty-four are added in the following parts. The fifth by ק, that is, קדשים, "kodoshim," of "sanctifications;" and is divided into eleven books, containing ninety chapters. The sixth with ט, that is, טהרות, "teharoth," of "purifications," in twelve books, and one hundred and twenty-six chapters.

10. Unto the Mishnah of Rabbi Judah they annex the תוסיפות, the "Tosiphot," or additions of Rabbi Chaiah his scholar, expounding many passages in his master's works. To them a more full explanation of the same doctrine of the Mishnah, which they call Baracetot, is subjoined, being the collection of some ante-Talmudical masters. About three hundred years after the destruction of the temple, [A.D. 270,] R. Johanan composed the Jerusalem Talmud, consisting of expositions, comments, and disputes, upon the whole Mishnah, excepting the last part, about *purifications.* A hundred years or thereabouts after that, [A.D. 420,] Rabbi Ashe composed the Babylonian Talmud, or Gemara. Thirty-two years, they say, he spent in this work, yet leaving it unfinished; seventy-one years after, it was completed by his disciples. And the whole work of both these Talmuds may be referred unto five heads; for,—(1.) They expound the text of the Mishnah; (2.) Decide questions of right and fact; (3.) Report the disputations, traditions, and constitutions of the doctors that lived between them and the writing of the Mishnah; (4.) Give *allegorical*, monstrous, expositions of the Scripture, which they call Midrashoth; and, (5.) Report stories of the like nature.

11. This at length is their *oral law* grown into; and in the learning and practising of these things consist the whole religion and worship of the Jews, there being not the most absurd saying of any of their doctors in those huge heaps of folly and vanity that they

do not equal unto, nay, that they are not ready to prefer before, the written word, that perfect and only guide of their church, whilst God was pleased with it.

In the dust of this confusion, here they dwell, loving this darkness more than light, because their deeds are evil. Having for many generations entertained a prejudicate imagination, that these *traditional figments*, amongst which their crafty masters have inserted many filthy and *blasphemous* fables against our Lord Christ and his Gospel, are of divine authority, and having utterly lost the *spiritual sense* of the written word, they are by it sealed up in blindness and obdurateness; and shall be so until the veil be taken away, when the appointed time of their deliverance shall come. A brief discovery of the falseness of this fancy of their *oral law*, which is the foundation of all that huge building of lies and vanities that their Talmuds are composed of, shall put an end to this discourse.

12. (1.) The *very story of the giving of the law* at Mount Sinai sufficiently discovers the folly of this imagination. This *oral law* the Jews are ready, on all occasions, to prefer before that which is written; and do openly profess that without it the other is of no use unto them! I desire, then, to know whence it is that all the circumstances of the giving and teaching of the less necessary are so exactly recorded, but *not one word* is spoken of this *oral law*, either of God's revealing of it to Moses, or of Moses' teaching of it to Joshua or any others. Strange! that so much should be recorded of every circumstance of the *less principal, lifeless law*, and not one word of either substance or circumstance of that which is, if these men may be believed, the very *life and soul* of the other. Maimonides, in Jad Chazachah, tells us there is mention made of it in Exod. xxiv. 12: "I will give thee," saith the Lord, "הַתּוֹרָה וְהַמִּצְוָה,—a law and commandment." תּוֹרָה, saith he, is the "written law;" מִצְוָה, the "oral:" when the next words are, אֲשֶׁר כָּתַבְתִּי לְהוֹרֹתָם,—"Which I have written, that thou mayest teach them;" the *written law* being on several accounts expressed by both those terms, and no other. How know they that any such law was given to Moses as they pretend, what testimony, witness, or record of it was had or made at the time of its giving, or in many generations, for two thousand years afterwards?

13. (2.) Did their forefathers at any time before the captivity *transgress* this *oral law*, or did they not? If they say they did not, but kept it, and observed it diligently, we may easily see of what importance it is, that the most strict observation of it could not preserve them from all manner of wickedness; and what a hedge it is to the written law, when, notwithstanding the obedience yielded unto it, that was utterly despised and neglected. If they shall say, that law also was broken by them, I desire to know whence it comes

to pass, that whereas God by his prophets doth reprove them for all their other sins, and in particular for contempt of his *written law*, the statutes, ordinances, and institutions of it, he nowhere once mentioneth this their greater guilt of despising the *oral law*, but there is as universal a silence concerning its transgression as there is of its giving and institution. Can we have any greater evidence of its being fictitious than this, that whereas it is pretended that it is the *main rule* of their obedience to God, God did never reprove them for the transgression of it, though, whilst he owned them as his church and people, he suffered none of their sins to pass by unreproved, especially not any of that importance which this is by them pretended to be of?

(3.) Moses was commanded to write the *whole law* that he received from God, and did so accordingly, Exod. xxiv. 3, 4, xxxiv. 28; Deut. xxxi. 9, 24. Where was this *oral law*, which they say was not to be written, when Moses was commanded to write the *whole law* that he had received of God, and did accordingly? This new law was not then coined, being indeed nothing but the product of their apostasy from the law which was written.

(4.) The sole ground and foundation of this oral law lies in the *imperfection of the written law.* This is that which they plead for the necessity of it: "The written law extends not to all necessary cases that occur in religion; many things are redundant, many wanting in it;" and hereof they gather great heaps of instances: so that they will grant that if the written law had been perfect, there had been no need of this traditional one. But whom in this matter shall we believe?—a few ignorant Jews, or God himself, bearing witness that his law is perfect, and requiring no more in his worship but what is in that law prescribed? See Ps. xix. 7, 8; Prov. xxx. 5, 6; Deut. iv. 1, 2. And this perfection of the written law, though it be perfectly destructive to their traditions, not only the Karaites among themselves do earnestly contend for, but also sundry of their Gemarists do acknowledge, especially when they forget their own concernments out of a desire to oppose the gospel. And to this head belong all the arguments that divines make use of to prove the perfection of the Scripture against the new Talmudists in Christianity.

(5.) God everywhere sends his people to the written law of Moses for the rule of their obedience, nowhere unto any Cabala, Deut. x. 12, 13, xi. 32, xxviii. 1; Josh. i. 7, 8, xxiii. 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 16; Isa. viii. 20. If there be such an oral law, it is one that God would not have any man to observe, which he calls none to the obedience of, nor did ever reprove any man for its transgression.

14. And many more arguments of the like nature may be added, to prove the vanity of this pretence. And yet this figment is the bottom of the present Judaical religion and obstinacy. When the

apostle wrote this Epistle, their apostasy was not yet arrived at this "rock of offence;" since their falling on it, they have increased their blindness, misery, and ruin. Then they were contented to try their cause by what God spake to their fathers "in the prophets;" which kept open a door of hope, and gave some advantages for their conversion, which are now shut up and removed, until God shall take this veil away from their faces, that they may see to the end of the things that were to be done away.

15. By this means principally have they, for many generations, both *shut out* the truth and *secured* themselves from conviction. For whatever is taught and revealed in the Scripture concerning the person, office, and work of the Messiah,—seeing they have *that* which they esteem a revelation of equal authority herewithal, teaching them a doctrine quite of another nature, and more suited unto their carnal principles and expectations,—they will rest rather in any evasion than give way to the testimony thereof. And whilst they have a firm persuasion, as they have, received by the tradition of many generations, that the written word is *imperfect*, but a half revelation of the mind of God, in itself *unintelligible*, and not to be received or understood but according to the sense of their oral law, now recorded in their Talmuds, what can the most plain and cogent testimonies of it avail unto their conviction? And this hath been the fatal way and means of the grand apostasy of both churches, *Judaical* and *Christian*. How far that of the Jews was overtaken with it in the days of our Lord's conversation on the earth, the Gospel doth abundantly declare; and how they have brought it unto its height, we have given now some brief account. That of the Roman church hath been the very same; and hath at length arrived unto almost the *same* issue, by the *same* degrees. This some of them perceiving, do not only defend the pharisaical opinion among the Jews about the oral law and succession of their traditions, as consonant to the pretensions of their own church, but also openly avow that a very great number of their several respective traditions are either the same, or that they nearly resemble one another; as doth expressly Josephus de Voysin in his Procemium to the Pugio Fidei of Raymundus Martini. And because it is evident that the same have been the way and means whereby both the Judaical and Roman church have apostatized and departed from the truth, and that they are the same also whereby they maintain and defend themselves in their apostasy and refusal to return unto the truth, I shall, ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ, manifest their consent and agreement in this principle about their traditions and authority of them, which have been the ruin of them both.

16. (1.) The Jews expressly contend that their oral law, their mass of traditions, was from God himself. They say, it was partly deli-

vered unto Moses on Mount Sinai, and partly added by him from divine revelations which he afterwards received. Hence the *authority* of it with them is *no less* than that of the written word (which hath all its authority from its divine original), and the *usefulness* of it is *much more.* For although they cannot deny but that this and that particular tradition,—that is, practice, custom, or exposition of any place of Scripture,—were first introduced, expressed, and declared, at such or such seasons, by such masters or schools amongst them, yet they will not grant that they were then *first invented* or found out, but only that they were then *first declared,* out of the cabalistical abyss wherein they were preserved from their first revelation; as all of them agree who have written any thing about the nature, propagation, and continuance of their oral law.

And this is the persuasion of the Romanists about their Cabala of traditions. They plead them to be *all of a divine original,* partly from Christ, and partly from his apostles. Whatever they have added unto the written word, yea, though it be never so contrary thereunto, still they pretend that it is part of the oral law which they have received from them by *living* tradition! Let one convention of their doctors determine that images are to be adored; another, that transubstantiation is to be believed; a third, add a new creed with an equal number of articles unto the old;—let one doctor advance the opinion of purgatory; another, of justification by works: all is one,—these things are not then *first invented,* but only *declared* out of that unsearchable treasure of traditions which they have in their custody. Had they not inlaid this persuasion in the minds of men, they know that their whole fabric would, of its own accord, have long since sunk into confusion. But they highly contend, at this day, that they need no other argument to prove any thing to be of a heavenly extract and divine original, but that themselves think so, and practise accordingly.

17. (2.) This oral law being thus given, the *preservation* of it, seeing Moses is dead long ago, must be inquired after. Now, the Jews assign a threefold depository of it;—first, the whole congregation; secondly, the sanhedrim; and thirdly, the high priest. To this end they affirm that it was *three times* repeated, upon the descent of Moses from Mount Sinai, as to what of it he had then received, and his after additions had the same promulgation. First, it was repeated by himself unto Aaron; secondly, by them both unto the elders; and thirdly, by the elders unto the whole congregation: or, as Maimonides in Jad Chazachah, Moses delivered it unto Eleazar, Phinehas, and Joshua, after the death of Aaron; by whom the consistory was instructed therein, who taught the people as occasion did require. What the people knew of it is uncertain, but what they did know was quickly lost. The consistory, or great sanhe-

drim, בית דין של שבעים ואחד, as they call it, "the house of judgment of seventy and one," was more faithful in its charge. Hence Rab. Moses in the same book, Tractat. ממרים, "of rebels" or "transgressors," teacheth us, בית דין הגדול שבירושלם הם עיקר תורה שבעל פה והם עמודי ההוראה ומהם חק ומשפט יוצא לכל ישראל;—"The great consistory" (or house of judgment) "at Jerusalem was the foundation of the oral law: these are the pillars of doctrine, from whom statutes and judgments went forth unto all Israel." And he afterwards affirms, with what truth may be easily judged, משהיה בית דין הגדול קים לא היתה מחלוקה בישראל;—"Whilst this great consistory continued, there was no dissension in Israel:" for not only the famous differences between Hillel and Shammai, with their disciples, which involved all the schools, scribes, and lawyers, among them, arose and were propagated whilst that consistory continued, but also the atheistical sect of the Sadducees rose unto that height and interest as to obtain the presidentship in the sanhedrim itself! But the high priests are those whom they fix upon as the principal conservators of this oral law. To this end they give us catalogues of them from first to last; that, by their uninterrupted succession, we may be secured of the incorrupt preservation of their original traditions. Only it may here be added, by the way, that *they bind not themselves* precisely, in all their religious observances, unto this oral law, whereunto they assign a divine original; but ascribe an authority unto the sanhedrim and the high priest to constitute things of themselves in the worship of God, beside and beyond the word. For whatever they pretend of their oral law, when they come unto particular instances, they would fain educe the constitutions of it from some word, or letter, or manner of interpretation of the Scripture itself; but those constitutions of the consistory and wise men they ascribe unto their own authority. Some of these are recounted by Maimonides, in his Preface unto Jad Chazachah; as the reading of the book or roll of Esther with fasting; lights on the feast of dedication; the fast on the seventh of Ab, or July; various mixtures and washings of hands;—things plainly of that nature which our Lord Jesus condemned amongst them. And it is observable how he frees them from transgressing that precept, Deut. xii. 32, "Thou shalt not add unto this word," by this constitution, לא אמרי הק"בה" צוה לעשות ערוב או לקרות מגלה בעונתה ואילו אמרו כן היו מוסיפין על התורה אלא כך אנו אומר' ות' ;—"For," saith he, "they say not that the holy, blessed God hath commanded these things, that there should be such mixtures, that the book of Esther should be read with fasting; for if they should say so, they should add to the law: but thus we speak, 'Such and such a prophet, or the consistory, commanded and appointed that the book of Esther should be read with fasting, to celebrate the glory of the holy, blessed God in our deliverance.'" And so of the rest. It seems, then, they may *add* what they will of their

own, so they entitle [prefix] not the name of God to their *inventions:* by which means they have set themselves at liberty to multiply *superstitious* observations at their pleasure; which they had actually done in the days of our Saviour, and thereby "made the law of God of none effect."

In all these things they are followed and imitated by the Romanists. In the same manner do they lay up the *stock* of their traditions. In general, they make the church the *repository* of them; although they do not so distinctly explain the way and means whereby they were committed thereunto as the Jews do. Unto the sanhedrim, councils are succeeded in the same office. But their nature, work, authority, assistance, and use, are so *variously disputed* amongst them, that nothing of *certainty* from them or by them, singly considered, is to be obtained. It is the high priest, or pope, that is the principal conservator of this *sacred treasury* of traditions; upon their *succession* doth the *certainty* of them depend. And whilst there is a pope at Rome, the knowledge of the *new oral law* will not fail, as the *old* one did not whilst the Jews had a high priest; though, in the pursuit of it, they *crucified the Messiah*, and continue to reject him unto this day. Besides, like the Jews, they content not themselves with what they pretend to be of *ancient tradition*, but assume a power of making *new constitutions* in the things of God; whereby they would have us to think they do not violate the *prohibition* of *adding*, because they ascribe them not unto the word of God, but to the authority of the *present church.* Thus far, therefore, they are fully agreed.

18. (3.) The Jews, in favour and unto the honour of these *traditions*, affirm that the *written word* without them is *imperfect*, and not to be understood but as it is interpreted by them. This they are constant unto, and earnestly contend for. Aben Ezra, in his Preface to the Law, discourseth at large of *five several ways* of the interpretation of it, but concludes at last that the whole written law of Moses is founded on the oral. וזה, saith he, למו לאות שסמך משה על תורה שבעל פה שהוא שמחה לבב;—"And this is a sign unto us that the law of Moses is founded on the oral law, which is the joy of our hearts." So apt are they to rejoice in a thing of nought! To the same purpose are the words of another *famous master* amongst them, Rabbi Bechai in Cad Hakkemach: עיקר התורה היא תורה שבעל פה שאין תורה שבכתב יכולה להתבאר כי אם ע"תורה שבע"פ;—"The oral law is the foundation of the written; nor can the written law be expounded but by the oral."

By this being the *foundation of the written law*, they intend that the sense of it is so inwrapped and contained therein, that without the explications thereof it cannot be understood. And to this end Manasseh, one of their late masters, expressly disputes that in many

things it is *defective* and in some things *redundant;* so that it is not able to give us a full and clear direction in the things of God without their *traditional explications.* And, in the confirmation of his opinion, he instanceth in sundry *precepts and prohibitions* that he would prove so obscure as that no obedience can be yielded unto them in a due manner without the help of the Cabala; which, because for the most part his exceptions from them are *childish cavils,* and have been answered by others, shall be here passed over. This they are arrived unto; this is the common persuasion of them all; and we shall yet hear what farther progress they have made. And herein are they imitated by their *successors.* Their *oral law* also is made by them the foundation of the *written.*

As those heretics of old, who, having got some *sophistical cavils* about *evil,* wherever they met with any one not of their mind, presently fell upon him with their *unde malum?* whence had evil its *original?* so thinking to bring him to the acknowledgment of *two supreme principles of things,* a good one and a bad one: thus, for the most part, the first question of a Romanist is, "How do you know the Scriptures to be the word of God?" and then the next word is, "The Cabala, the תורה שבעל פה, *oral law, tradition,* these are the foundation of it." And in their progress they fail not to assert *two principles,* both borrowed from the Jews;—first, That the Scripture is *imperfect,* and doth not give us a full and complete account of all things that are to be believed and practised, that God may be glorified and our own souls saved; secondly, That what is delivered therein can no way be rightly and truly understood but by the help of those *traditions* which they have in their custody. But although these are good, useful inventions, and they are men that want not ability to find out what is conducing unto their own advantage, yet they cannot be allowed the credit of being their first authors, seeing they are expressly borrowed of the Jews.

19. (4.) When these two laws, the law of God and their own, do come in competition, the Jews, many of them, do expressly prefer that of *their own invention* before the other, and that both as to certainty and use. Hence they make it the *foundation* of their church, and the only *safe means* to preserve the truth. So are we informed by Isaac Corbulensis in עמודי גולה. "Do not think," saith he, "that the written law is the foundation; for the foundation is the oral law: for by that law was the covenant made, as it is written, 'According to these words do I make a covenant with thee,' Exod. xxxiv. 27," (where he takes his argument from that expression, עַל־פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, wresting *foolishly,* as they do all, his oral law from these words, עַל־פִּי, which signify nothing but "according to," nor are any other words intended but those delivered to Moses and written by him.) "And these," he adds, "are the treasures of the

holy, blessed God; for he knew that Israel should be carried captive among other people, and that the nations would transcribe their books, and therefore would not commit their secret law to writing."

It seems these things were left them in secret tradition, because God was not willing that any besides themselves should know his mind and will. But they have at last showed themselves more full of benignity towards mankind than they would allow God to be, inasmuch as they have committed this secret law to writing. And to this purpose is their confession in מזבח הזהב, "The Golden Altar:" אי אפשר לעמוד על עיקר תורתנו הקדושה שהיא תורה שבכתב כי אם עי תורה שב'עף שהוא פירושה;—"It is impossible for us to stand or abide upon the foundation of our holy law, which is the written law, unless it be by the oral law, which is the exposition thereof:" wherein they not only declare their judgment concerning their *traditions*, but also express the reason of their obstinate adherence unto them; which is, that *without it they cannot maintain themselves in their present Judaism.* And so, indeed, is the case with them. Innumerable testimonies of the Scriptures rising up directly against their infidelity, they were not able to keep their station, but by a horrible corrupting of them through their traditions. On this account it is a common thing with them, in the advice they give unto their disciples, to prefer the *study of the Talmud* before the *study of the Scripture*, and the *sayings of their wise men* before the *sayings of the prophets;* and they plainly express an utter disregard of the written word, any further than as they suppose the sense of it explained in their *oral law.* Neither are they here forsaken by their associates. The principal design of *all the books* which have been lately published by the Romanists, and they have not been a few, hath been to prove the certainty and sufficiency of their *traditions* in matters of their faith and worship above that of the *written word.*

20. (5.) There are some few remaining, among the eastern Jews, who reject all this story concerning the *oral law,* and professedly adhere unto the *written word* only. These the masters of their *present religion* and persuasion do, by common consent, brand as *heretics*, calling them Scripturists, or Scripturarians, or Biblists,—the very name of reproach wherewith the Romanists stigmatize all those who reject *their traditions.* These are their קראים, that is, "Biblists" or "Scripturarians;" and everywhere they term them מינאים, "Heretics," and endeavour to prove them guilty מינות, of "heresy" in the highest degree. Some of them would have them to be the offspring of the old Sadducees, to deny the resurrection and the world to come; as men care not much, usually, what they impute unto those whom they esteem hereties. But the falsity hereof is notorious, and so acknowledged by others, and confuted by the

writings of the Karaites themselves: yea, the author of Cosri affirms that they are *more studious in the law than the rabbins;* and that their *reasons are more weighty than theirs,* and *lead more towards the naked sense of the Scripture.* But this is that which they charge upon them, namely, that, rejecting the *sure rule* of their *traditions,* they ran into *singular expositions* of the law, and so divided it, and made *many laws* of it, having no certain means of agreement among themselves. So saith Rabbi Jehuda Levita, the author of the fore-mentioned Cosri: הקראים כפי סברתם ירבו התורות,—"The Karaites multiply laws according to their own opinion;" which he inveighs against them for, after he had commended them. And the same is objected against them by Maimonides in Pirke Aboth: as though it were not known that the greatest part of their Talmud, the sacred treasury of their *oral law,* is taken up with differences and disputes of their masters among themselves, with a multitude of various opinions and *contradictory conceptions* about their *traditions.* Thus deal the Romanists also with their adversaries, this they charge them withal. They are heretics, Biblists; and, by adhering to the Scripture *alone,* have no certainty among themselves, but run into diversities of opinion, having deserted the *unerring rule* of their Cabala;—when the world is filled with the noise of their own conflicts, notwithstanding the pretended relief which they have thereby.

It remains that we consider how these traditions come to be communicated unto others, out of the secret storehouse wherein originally they were deposited. This, as I have elsewhere and partly before declared, was by their being committed unto writing by Rabbi Judah Hakkadosh; whose collections, with their expositions in their Talmud, do give us a *perfect account,* if we may believe them, of that secret law which came down unto them by oral tradition from Moses. And something like hereunto is by the Romanists pretended. Many of their *traditions,* they say, are recorded in the *rescripts* of *popes, decrees of councils,* and *constitutions of the canon law,* and the like sacred means of the declaration of the *oral instructions* of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles.

But herein the Jews deal with us far more ingenuously than they. They tell us plainly that now their *whole oral law is written,* and that they have no reserve of *authentic* traditions not yet declared. So that where Austin says of his adversaries, "Nescit habere, præter scripturas legitimas et propheticas, Judæos quasdam traditiones suas quas non scriptas habent, sed memoriter tenent, et alter in alterum loquendo transfundit, quam deuterosin vocant,"[1] either he knew not of the Mishnah that was then written, or this opinion of *secret traditions* was continued until the finishing and promulgation of the Babylonian

[1] Aust. lib. ii. Con. adver. Leg. et Prophet. cap. i.

Talmud, which was sundry years after his death. But here the Romanists fail us; for although they have given us "heaps upon heaps" of their traditions, by the means afore mentioned, yet they plead that they have still an *inexhaustible treasure of them*, laid up in their church stores and breast of their *holy father*, to be drawn forth at all times, as occasion shall require.

And thus have we taken a brief prospect of the consent of both the apostatical churches in that *principle* which hath been the means of their apostasy, and is the great engine whereby they are rendered incurable therein.

EXERCITATION VIII.

THE FIRST DISSERTATION CONCERNING THE MESSIAH, PROVING HIM TO BE PROMISED OF OLD.

1. Principles presupposed in the apostle's discourse in his Epistle to the Hebrews—First, a Messiah promised from the foundation of the world. 2, 3. Of the evil that is in the world. 4. Of sin and punishment—Original and entrance of them. 5. Ignorance of mankind about them. 6. The sin and fall of Adam—Their consequents. 7. Jews' opinion about the sin of Adam; also of the curse and corruption of nature. 8–12. Their sense of both at large evinced. 13. God not unjust if all mankind had perished in this condition. 14. Instance of the sin and punishment of angels—Difference between the sin of angels and man—Angels lost, mankind relieved. 15. Evidences of that deliverance. 16. How attainable—Not by men themselves; 17. Not by angels; 18. Nor by the law—That proved against the Jews. 19. Their fable of the law made before the world, with the occasion of it—The patriarchs saved before the giving of the law. 20. Observation of the moral precepts of the law no means of relief; 21. Nor the sacrifices of it. 22. The new covenant—God the author of it—How to be accomplished. 23, 24. The first promise of it, Gen. iii. 15, discussed. 25. Sense of the Jews upon it manifested; 26, 27. Examined. 28. Promise of a deliverer, the foundation of all religion in the world. 29. The promise renewed unto Abraham, Gen. xii. 1–3—Nature of it as given unto him. 30–33. Testified unto and confirmed—Gen. xlix. 10; Num. xxiv. 17, 19; Job xix. 25, opened; with sundry other places—End of the separation of the posterity of Abraham unto a peculiar people and church. 34. This deliverer, the Messiah—Denotation of the word—The person who.

1. We proceed now unto our principal intendment in all these discourses, which is, the consideration and discussion of those *great principles*, as of all religion in general, so of the Christian in particular, which the apostle supposeth as a foundation of his whole treaty [reasoning] with the Hebrews, and which are the *basis* that he stands upon in the management of his whole design. For in all discourses that are *parenetical*, as this Epistle for the most part is, there are always some principles taken for granted, which give life and efficacy unto the exhortations in them, and whereinto they are resolved. For, as to *persuade* men unto *particulars* in faith, opinion, or prac-

tice, without a previous conviction of such *general principles of truth* as from which the persuasions used do naturally flow and arise, is a thing weak and inefficacious; so to be exercised in the demonstration of the *principles* themselves, when the especial end aimed at is to *persuade*, would bring confusion into all discourse.

Wherefore, although our apostle do assert and confirm those *dogmata* and articles of truth which he dealt with the Hebrews in a way of persuasion to embrace, yet he supposeth and takes for granted those more general κυρίας δόξας, or *first maxims*, which are the *foundation* both of the *doctrines* and *exhortations* insisted on, as all skill in teaching doth require. And these are those which now we aim to draw forth and consider, being these that follow:—

First, That there was a Messiah, or Saviour of mankind from sin and punishment, *promised* upon, and from, the first entrance of sin into the world, in whom all acceptable worship of God was to be founded, and in whom all the religion of the sons of men was to centre.

Secondly, That this Messiah, long before promised, *was now actually exhibited* in the world, and had finished the work committed unto him, when the apostle wrote this Epistle.

Thirdly, That *Jesus of Nazareth* was this Messiah, and that what he had done and suffered was the work and duty promised of old concerning him.

There is *not a line* in the Epistle to the Hebrews that doth not *virtually* begin and end in these principles,—not an assertion, not a doctrine, not an exhortation, that is not built on this triple foundation. They are also the great verities τῆς ὁμολογίας Χριστιανῆς, of the *Christian profession* or religion. A sincere endeavour, therefore, in their explanation and vindication,—especially in these days, wherein as on the one hand there are various thoughts of heart about the Jews, their present condition and expectation, so on the other there are many who are ready with a presumptuous boldness ἀκίνητα κινεῖν, and to call in question the *fundamentals of all religion*,—may not be unacceptable. Now, the *first* of these *principles* is, at this day, by several vain imaginations, *obscured* by the Jews, to their utter loss of all benefit by it, and hath been so for many generations; although it was the *life and soul* of the religion of their forefathers, as shall be demonstrated; and the *two latter* are by them expressly *denied*, and maliciously *contended against*. Here, then, we shall fix and confirm these principles, in the order wherein we have laid them down, declaring on every one of them the *conceptions* and *persuasions of the Jews* concerning the promised Messiah; removing, in the close, their objections against the faith of Christians in this matter, in a peculiar Exercitation to that purpose. And the *confirmation* and vindication of the first of these principles is that which our present discourse is designed unto.

2. Besides the testimony of God himself in his word, we have a concurrent suffrage from the *whole creation*, that man in the beginning was formed, as in the *image*, so in the *favour* of God, and unto his glory. And as he was not *liable* unto any evil which is the effect of God's displeasure, nor *defective* in any good necessary to preserve him in the condition wherein he was made, so he was *destitute* of nothing that was any way requisite to carry him on unto that further enjoyment of God whereunto he was designed, Gen. i. 26, 31, Eccles. vii. 29. For God, being infinitely *good, wise, righteous*, and *powerful*, creating man to know, love, honour, and enjoy him, and thereby to *glorify* those holy properties of his nature which exerted themselves in his creation (which that he did, the nature of those *intellectual perfections* wherewith he endowed him doth undeniably evince), it was utterly impossible that either he should not delight in the work of his own hands, the effect of his own wisdom and power, or not furnish him with those faculties and abilities by which he might answer the ends of his creation. To suppose a failure in any of these, is contrary to the prime dictates of reason; for *infinite wisdom* can do nothing *in vain*, nothing not perfectly suited unto the end whereunto it is designed. Neither can *infinite goodness* allow of *any defect* in aught that proceedeth from it: Gen. i. 31, "God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good." Hence many philosophers saw, and granted, that the *first cause* in the production of all things did ὁδῷ βαδίζειν, proceed by such a *certain reason and way* as that every thing might, both in itself and with reference unto its own especial end, and also in relation unto the universe, have its proper rectitude and goodness, sufficient unto its station and condition. This ὁδὸς the Scripture calls Βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. i. 11,—"The counsel of the will of God;" expressing a contemperation of absolute sovereignty and infinite wisdom. And these *uncontrollable notions of nature*, or reason, cast men of old into their entanglements about the *original of evil:* for this they plainly saw, that it must be *accidental* and *occasional;* but where to fix that *occasion* they knew not. Those who, to extricate themselves out of this difficulty, fancied two supreme principles or causes, the one author of all good, the other of all evil, were ever exploded, as persons bidding defiance unto all principles of reason, whereby we are distinguished from the beasts that perish. This, I say, men generally discerned, that *evil*, wherein it *now lies*, could not have entered into the world without a disturbance of that *harmony* wherein all things at the beginning were constituted by infinite wisdom and goodness, and some interruption of that dependence on God from whence it did proceed.

The very first apprehensions of the nature of God and the condition of the universe declare that man was formed *free from sin*,

which is his voluntary subduction of himself from under the government of his Maker; and *free from trouble*, which is the effect of his displeasure on that subduction or deviation;—in which two the whole nature of *evil* consisteth: so that it must have some other *original.*

3. Furthermore; in this first effort of immense power did God glorify himself, as in the wisdom and goodness wherewith it was accompanied, so also in that *righteousness* whereby, as the supreme rector and governor of all, he allotted unto his rational creatures the law of their obedience, annexing a reward thereunto in a mixture of *justice* and *bounty;* for, that obedience should be rewarded is of justice, but that such a reward should be proposed unto the *temporary* obedience of a creature as is the *eternal enjoyment of God*, was of mere grace and bounty. And that things should have continued in the state and condition wherein they were created, I mean as unto mankind, supposing an accomplishment of the obedience prescribed unto them, is manifest from the very first notions we have of the nature of God: for we do no sooner conceive that he is, but withal we assent that "he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," Heb. xi. 6; which is essential unto him, and inseparable from his nature as the sovereign ruler of the works of his hands. And thus was the *continuance* of this blessed state of the creation of all things provided for, and laid in a tendency unto further glory, being absolutely exclusive of any distance between God and man, besides that which is natural, necessary, and infinite, from their *beings.* There was no sin on the one side, nor disfavour on the other. And this secured the order of the universe; for what should cause any confusion there whilst the *law of its creation was observed*, which could not be transgressed by *brute* and *inanimate* creatures?

4. That this estate of things hath been altered from time immemorial; that there is a corrupt spring of sin and disorder in the nature of man; that the whole world lieth in ignorance, darkness, evil, and confusion; that there is an alienation and displeasure between God and mankind, God revealing his wrath and judgments from heaven, whence at first nothing might be expected but fruits of goodness and pledges of love, and man naturally dreading the presence of God and trembling at the effects of it, which at first was his life, joy, and refreshment,—*reason* itself, with prudent observation, will discover; it hath done so unto many contemplative men of old. "The whole creation groaneth" out this complaint, as the apostle witnesseth, Rom. viii. 20, 22; and God makes it manifest in his judgments every day, chap. i. 18. That things were not made at first in that state and condition wherein now they are, that they came not thus immediately from the hand of infinite wisdom and goodness, is easily discernible. God made not man to be at a *perpetual quarrel* with him, nor to fill the world with tokens of his *displeasure*

because of sin. This men saw of old by the light of nature; but what it should be that opened the *flood-gates* unto all that evil and sin which they saw and observed in the world, they could not tell. The springs of it, indeed, they searched after; but with more vanity and disappointment than those who sought for the heads of the Nile. The evils they saw were catholic and unlimited, and therefore not to be assigned unto *particular causes;* and of any *general one* proportioned unto their production they were utterly ignorant. And this ignorance filled all their wisdom and science with fatal mistakes, and rendered the best of their *discoveries* but mere, uncertain, conjectures. Yea, the poets, who followed the *confused rumours* of old traditions about things whose *original* was *occasional* and accidental, give us a better shadow of truth than the philosophers, who would reduce them unto general rules of reason, which they would no way answer.

> "Post ignem ætheria domo
> Subductum, Macies et nova Febrium
> Terris incubuit cohors;
> Semotique prius tarda necessitas
> Leti corripuit gradum," Hor. Car. lib. i. Od. iii. 29,—

is a better allusion to the *original* of sin and punishment than all the disputations of the philosophers will afford us.

5. But that which they could not attain unto, and which because they could not attain unto, they wandered in all their apprehensions about God and themselves, without *certainty* or consistency, we are clearly acquainted withal by divine revelation. The sum of it is briefly proposed by the apostle: Rom. v. 12, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." *Sin* and *death* are comprehensive of all that is *evil* in any kind in the world. All that is *morally* so is sin; all that is *penally* so is death. The entrance of both into the world was by the sin of one man, that is, Adam, the common father of us all. This the philosophers knew not, and therefore knew nothing clearly of the condition of mankind in relation unto God. But two things doth the Scripture teach us concerning this *entrance of evil* into the world:—

First, The *punishment* that was threatened unto and inflicted on the disobedience of Adam. Whatever there is of disorder, darkness, or confusion, in the nature of things here below; whatever is uncertain, irregular, horrid, unequal, destructive, in the universe; whatever is *penal* unto man, or may be so, in this life or unto eternity; whatever the *wrath* of the holy, righteous God, *revealing itself from heaven*, hath brought, or shall ever bring, on the works of his hands, —are to be referred unto this head. Other original of them can no man assign.

Secondly, The *moral corruption* of the nature of man, the spring of all *sin*, the other head of evil, proceeded hence also; for by this

means, that which before was good and upright is become an inexhaustible treasure of sin. And this was the state of things in the world immediately upon the sin and *fall* of Adam.

Now, the work which we assign unto the Messiah is the deliverance of mankind from this state and condition. Upon the supposition, and revelation, of *this entrance of sin*, and the evil that ensued thereon, is the whole doctrine of his office founded, as shall afterwards more largely be declared. And because we contend against the Jews that he was promised and exhibited for a relief, in the wisdom, grace, and righteousness of God, against this sin and misery of mankind, as our apostle also expressly proveth, chap. ii. of his Epistle unto them; this being denied by them, as that which would overthrow all their fond imaginations about his person and office, we must consider what is their sense and apprehension about these things, with what may be thence educed for their own conviction; and then confirm the truth of our assertion from those testimonies of Scripture which themselves own and receive.

6. The FIRST effect and consequent of the sin of Adam, was the *punishment* wherewith it was attended. What is written hereof ῥητῶς in the Scripture, the Jews neither do nor can deny. Death was in the commination given to deter him from his transgression: מוֹת תָּמוּת, Gen. ii. 17;—"Dying, thou shalt die." Neither can it be reasonably pretended to be singly death unto his own person which is intended in that expression; the event sufficiently evinceth the contrary. Whatever is or might be *evil* unto himself and his whole posterity, with the residue of the creation, so far as he or they might be any way concerned therein, hath grown out of this commination. And this is sufficiently manifested in the first execution of it, Gen. iii. 16–19. The *malediction* was but the execution of the *commination.* It was not consistent with the justice of God to increase the penalty after the sin was committed. The *threatening*, therefore, was the rule and measure of the *curse.* But this is here extended by God himself, not only to all the miseries of man (Adam and his whole posterity) in this life, in labour, disappointment, sweat, and sorrow, with *death* under, and by virtue of, the curse, but to the *whole earth* also, and consequently unto those *superior regions* and orbs of heaven by whose influence the earth is as it were governed and disposed unto the use of man, Hos. ii. 21, 22.

It may be yet further inquired, what was to be the *duration* and continuance of the punishment to be inflicted in the pursuit of this commination and malediction. Now, there is not any thing in the least to intimate that it should have a term prefixed unto it wherein it should expire, or that it should not be commensurate unto the existence or being of the sinner. God lays the *curse* on man, and there he leaves him, and that for ever. A miserable

life he was to spend, and then to *die under the curse of God*, without hope of emerging into a better condition. About his subsistence after this life we have no controversy with the Jews. They all acknowledge the *immortality* of the soul; for the sect of the Sadducees is long since extinct, neither are they followed by the Karaites in their atheistical opinions, as hath been declared. Some of them, indeed, incline unto the Pythagorean metempsychosis, but all acknowledge the soul's perpetuity.

Supposing, then, Adam to die *penally* under the curse of God,—as without extraordinary relief he must have done, the righteousness and truth of God being engaged for the execution of the threatening against him,—I desire to know what should have been the state and condition of his soul? Doth either revelation or reason intimate that he should not have continued for ever under the same penalty and curse, in a state of death or separation from God? And if he should have done so, then was *death eternal* in the commination. This is that which, with respect unto the present effects in this life, and the punishment due to sin, is termed by our apostle ἡ ὀργὴ ἐρχομένη, 1 Thess. i. 10, "the wrath to come," from whence the Messiah is the deliverer.

Nor will the Jews themselves contend that the guilt of any sin respects only *temporal* punishment. The event of sin unto themselves they take to be that only; imagining their observation of the law of Moses, such as it is, to be a sufficient expiation of punishment eternal: but unto all strangers from the law, all that have not a relief provided, they make every sin mortal; and Adam, as I suppose, had not the privilege of the present Jews, to observe Moses' law. Wherefore they all agree that by his repentance he delivered himself from death eternal: which if it were not due unto his sin, he could not do; for no man can by any means *escape* that whereof he is in no danger. And this *repentance* of his they affirm to have been attended with *severe discipline* and self-maceration; intimating the greatness of his sin and the difficulty of his escape from the punishment due thereunto. So Rabbi Eliezer, in Pirke Aboth, cap. xx.: באחד בשבת נכנס אדם במי גיחון העליון;—"On the first day of the week Adam entered into the waters of the upper Gihon, until the waters came unto his neck; and he afflicted himself seven weeks, until his body became like a sieve. And Adam said before the holy, blessed God, 'Lord of the whole world, let my sins, I pray thee, be done away from me, and accept of my repentance; that all ages may know that there is repentance, and that thou wilt receive them that repent and turn unto thee.'" Hence, also, they tell us, that upon the pardon of his sin he sang a song of praise unto the Lord on the Sabbath day; which is mentioned in the Targum on the Song of Solomon, chap. i. 1, as one of the songs in reference whereunto that of Solomon is

called, שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים, "The Song of Songs," or the most excellent of them. And although, indeed, that expression, מוֹת תָּמוּת, "Dying, thou shalt die," according to the propriety of the Hebrew tongue, denotes only the certainty and vehemency of the death threatened, in which case it useth *reduplications*, yet some of them have not been averse to apprehend a twofold death, of the body and of the soul, to be intimated in that expression, as Fagius on the place well observes. Body and soul, they say, both sinned; and therefore both were to be punished: אילו הבשר חוטא בלא רוח מדוע הנפש נענשת וכי וזה חוטא וזה נענש אלא כך הדבר שניהם חוטאים באחד;—"If the flesh sin without the spirit, why is the soul punished? Is it one thing that sins, and another that is punished? or rather is it not thus, that both sin together?" and so both are justly punished together.

7. Thus is the condition of the sin and punishment of our *first parents* themselves acknowledged by them; and the same is that of their *posterity*. What was threatened unto, what was inflicted upon, those who *first* sinned, they are all liable and obnoxious unto. Are they not all as subject unto death as was Adam himself? are the miseries of *man* in his *labour*, or the sorrows of *women in childbearing*, taken away? is the earth itself freed from the effects of the curse? do they not *die* who never "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression?" The Jews themselves grant that all death is penal: אין מות בלא חטא ואין ייסורין בלא עון;—"There is no death without sin, no punishment or correction without iniquity." It is the saying of R. Ame in the Talmud, Tractat. Sabbat., cited in Sepher Ikharim, lib. iv. cap. xiii. And this principle Maimonides carries so high as to deny all יסורין של אהבה, "correction of love," affirming none to be of that mind but some Gæonims, deceived by the sect of Muatzali, More Nebuch. pag. 3, cap. xvii. And they who die penally under the curse abide in no other estate than that mentioned. They acknowledge, also, the remainder of the curse on the earth itself on the same account: העולם כלו לא נברא אלא בשביל האדם ואחר שאדם חטא האדמה חסרה שלמותה;—"The whole world," says one of their masters, "was not created but for man; and therefore after man sinned, it came short of its first perfection." But these things being of some use for their conviction, as also to discover the perverse obstinacy of some of their later masters, we may a little more particularly take them along with us.

8. First, They acknowledge that Adam was a *common head* unto all mankind. So saith Manasseh Ben Israel, from their principles: "Cum itaque esset Adam futurus caput et principium humanæ naturæ, necesse erat illi a Deo conferri omnem perfectionem et scientiam," De Fragilitate, pag. 34;—"Whereas Adam was to be the head and principle of human nature, it was necessary that God should endow him with all perfection of knowledge." And this

perfection of his knowledge Aben Ezra, on Gen. ii., proves from God's bringing all creatures unto him, to give them names according to their nature. And the same author again, in his discourse, De Termino Vitæ: "Aben Ezra inquit, nominibus propriis in sacra Scriptura non præfigi הא הידיעה, He demonstrativum, quod tamen in voce Adam sit, Gen. iii. 22; ratio est quia in Adamo notantur omnes ejus posteri, et universa species humana designatur;"—"Aben Ezra says that 'He Hajedia' is not prefixed unto proper names in the Scripture, only it is so unto the word 'Adam,' Gen. iii. 22; and the reason is, because in Adam all his posterity, the whole race of mankind, is denoted and signified." Now, this could not be but by virtue of some divine constitution; for naturally Adam could have no other relation to his posterity than every other man hath unto his own: and this was no other but that *covenant* which God made with all mankind in him; whose promises and threatenings, rewards and punishments, must therefore equally respect them with him.

Wherefore, secondly, they grant that on this account "his sin was imputed unto all his posterity;" that is, some of them do so, and those the most sober of them. So Rabbi Menahem Rakanatensis, in Sec. Bereshith, etc.: אין לתמוה על חטא אדם וחוה;—"It is no wonder why the sin of Adam and Eve was engraven, and sealed with the signet of the King, to be propagated unto all following generations; for in the day that Adam was created, all things were finished, so that he was the perfection and complement of the whole workmanship of this world. Therefore when he sinned, the whole world sinned; whose sin we bear and suffer, which is not so in the sin of his posterity." To be "sealed with the signet of the King," is their expression of God's constitution.

And these words are very consonant to those of our apostle, Rom. v. 12, "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that" (or "because in him") "all have sinned." To the same purpose speaks the Targum on Eccles. vii. 29, in the copies followed by the Jayan [Paris Polyglot] and London Bibles (for so the words are not in those of Buxtorf, nor the Biblia Regia): "God made the first man upright and innocent before him; but the serpent and Eve seduced him, וגרמו לאסתקפא עלוהו יום מותא ולכל דירין ארעא—and gave cause why the day of death should come on him and all the inhabitants of the earth." And we can have no more authentic testimony of the apprehensions of their ancient doctors than what their Targums afford us. And therefore Joseph Albo, in Seher Itharim, expressly concludes, lib. i. cap. xi., that "all the punishments relating unto Adam and Eve for their first sin belong unto all mankind." And whereas they fancy that some persons spent their days without actual sin, at least any such as should deserve death, they charge their death on the guilt of the sin of Adam. So

the Targum on the last chapter of Ruth: "And Hobed begat Jesse, who was called Nachash; and there was no iniquity or corruption in him, for which he should be delivered into the hand of the angel of death to take his soul from him: and he lived many days, until the counsel that the serpent gave to Eve abode before the Lord; and upon that counsel were all the inhabitants of the earth made guilty of death; and upon the account of that sin died Jesse the righteous." Lud. Cappellus, in his annotations on John iii., hath an observation on this passage in the Targum not unworthy consideration. The Jews call Jesus ישו, without ע, which differs little from ישי, and so he may be here intended; for he may be called נחש, both because he was prefigured by the brazen serpent, and because the names of נחש and משיח are the same by gematry, or in their numeral letters,—a great occasion amongst them to change the names of persons and things. And this they might have from some tradition, which they understood not. The like testimony we have in Siphre: אר׳ יוסי הגלילי צא ולמד;—"Rabbi Jose the Galilean said, 'Go forth and learn the merit of Messiah the king, and the reward of that righteous one above the first Adam, who had only negative precepts given unto him, which he transgressed. Behold how many deaths befell him and his generations, and the generations of his generations, unto the end of all generations!'" Answerable unto that of the apostle, Rom. v. 18, "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

And this punishment of the sin of Adam and Eve they grant to have been so terrible, that they say that in the day they were cast out of paradise God lamented over them: כמה דאתדנו אדם והוה ואתאדכו מנגתא דעדן ואספיד מרי עלמא עלוהון;—"Even as Adam and Eve, when they were judged and cast out of the garden of Eden, and the Lord of the world lamented over them," Targum on Lamenta., chap. i. 1. And to show also that the whole creation was made subject unto vanity upon the sin of our first parents, Moses Haddarshan in Bereshith Rabba, on Gen. iii. 6, informs us that Eve gave of the fruit of the tree which she took unto all the beasts of the field and birds of the air, חול only (which they interpret "the phœnix") excepted. The truth, indeed, in these expressions is clouded with fables and trifles; but they who are offended at them may do well to direct us unto Judaical writers that are free from such follies. And yet on these things do innumerable poor souls venture their eternal condition, in an opposition to the blessed gospel of the glorious God.

9. The later masters, I acknowledge, are in this whole matter lubricous and uncertain; and they have been so in an especial manner ever since they began to understand the plea of Christians, for the necessity of *satisfaction* to be made by the sufferings of the Messiah,

from the doctrine of the sin and fall of man. Hence Abarbanel, in his commentary on Isa. liii., expressly argues against those sufferings of the Messiah, from the *non-necessity* of them with reference unto the sin of Adam. They contend also, some of them, that it was not so sorely revenged as we plead it to have been. "Ask a heretic" (a Christian), saith Lipman in his Nizzachon, "how it can enter into their hearts to think that God should use so great severity against the sin of Adam, that he should hold him bound for so small a matter, namely, for the eating of an apple, that he should destroy him in this world and that to come; and that not him only, but all his posterity."

But the blind Pharisee disputes not so much against us as against God himself. Who was it that denounced death in case he so transgressed? who was it that pronounced him miserable, and the world accursed, on the account thereof? Are we to blame, if the Jews are not pleased with the ways of God? Besides, although to *eat an apple* be in itself but a small thing, yet to disobey the command of the great God is no such small matter as the Jew supposeth; especially that command which set boundaries unto that excellent condition wherein Adam, in the right of all his posterity, was placed. But these exceptions owe their original unto a discovery of the tendency of that truth, which otherwise, as we have showed, they are convinced of, and which we have sufficiently cleared from the Scripture.

10. The SECOND consequent of the first sin of man is the *moral corruption of nature*, the spring of all that evil of actual sin that is in the world. And herein we have a full consent from the Jews, delivered after their manner, both in the Targums, Talmuds, and private writings of their principal masters; for an evil concupiscence in the heart of man, from his very conception, they generally acknowledge.

The name they give unto it is יצר הרע,—"figmentum malum," the evil figment of the heart; properly enough, from Gen. vi. 5: "And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth; וְכָל־יֵצֶר מַחְשְׁבֹת לִבּוֹ רַק רַע כָּל־הַיּוֹם,—and that the whole figment of the thoughts (or computation) of his heart was only evil every day." Hence have they taken their יצר הרע; a more proper name than that used by Christian divines, of "originale peccatum." And it is a ludicrous ignorance in some of the late rabbins, who profess themselves to deny original sin,—as doth the author of the Questions and Objections published by Brenius, and others of them,—and yet in the meantime grant this evil figment in all mankind, which was not in Adam in his innocency. And hereunto they oppose that יצר הטוב, that "good concupiscence," which they fancy to come on every one at the age of thirteen years, when he becomes "filius præ-

cepti," or liable unto the commands of God. The Targumists term it in the Chaldee tongue, יצרא בישא, to the same purpose. And it is mentioned by them, Ps. xiii. 5, "that יצרא בישא, the evil figment, say not I have ruled over him;" instead of "the enemy," for it is the chief enemy of men. Twice also it is mentioned in the Targum of Ps. l. 14: נכוש יצרא בישא;—"Restrain the evil figment, and it shall be accounted before God as a sacrifice." Doubtless none more acceptable. And to the same purpose the words are also verse 23. And in Ps. xci. 12, "That thy foot stumble not at the evil figment, which is like a stone;" that is, "That it seduce thee not, that it cause thee not to offend, to stumble and fall into sin." See James i. 14. And Ps. cxix. 70, they call it absolutely יצרא דלב, "the figment," or evil fomes of the heart: אטפש היך תרב יצרא דלבהון;—"The figment of their heart is made thick (or hard) as with fatness;" an expression not unusual in the Scripture to set out impenitency and security in sinning, Isa. vi. 10. And in Isa. lxii. 10 they mention הירהור יצרא, "the thought of lust," or of "the figment;" which is that "conceiving" of it mentioned by James, chap. i. 14. For הירהור is the inward evil thought of the heart, or the first motion of sin. Moreover, they do not unfitly describe it by another property; as Eccles. ix. 14, יצרא בישא דמתיל למלך רב;—"The evil figment (or concupiscence), which is like unto a great king,"—namely, because of its power. On which account in the New Testament it is said *βασιλεύειν*, to "reign" as a king, because of the subjection unto it *ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*, "in the lusts" or concupiscence of the heart, Rom. vi. 12; and *κυριεύειν*, or to have "dominion," verse 14, which is to the same purpose with that of the Targumist: "Evil concupiscence is like unto a great king." And this testimony we have given unto this moral corruption of nature in the Targums, the most ancient records of the Judaical apprehensions about these things that are now extant, or have been so for many ages.

11. The Talmudists have expressed the same thoughts about this inbred and indwelling sin; and, to set forth their conceptions about it, they have given it several names not unsuited unto those descriptions of it which are given us by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament; as,—

First, They call it רע, that is, "malum," evil; a name, as they say, given by God himself, Gen. viii. 21. Hence is that observation of R. Moses Haddarshan, from R. Jose in Bereshith Rabba: עלוב מאוד;—"Sad," or dark, "is that mass against which He that made it gives testimony that it is 'evil;' and our masters affirm that naught is that plant, which He that planted it witnesseth to be evil." And in answer hereunto it is termed in the New Testament, *ἡ ἁμαρτία*, "that sin," that evil thing that dwelleth in us, Rom. vii. 17.

Secondly, They say that Moses calleth it עָרְלָה, "præputium,"

or "uncircumcision," Deut. x. 16. And therefore in Tract. Sanhed. cap. xi., to the question, When may an infant be made partaker of the world to come? R. Nachman, the son of Isaac, answereth, מיטעה שכימל, presently after he is *circumcised;* circumcision being admitted of old as the sign of the taking away by grace of the natural *evil figment* of the heart. And in answer hereunto, it is called by our apostle ἀκροβυστία, or "uncircumcision," Col. ii. 13.

Thirdly, They say David calls it טמא, an "unclean thing." This they draw from Ps. li. 10, by the *rule of contraries*, a great guide in their expositions: "Create in me a *clean heart,* O God;" whence it appears that the heart of itself is *unclean.* And the apostle gives it us under the same name and notion, 1 Thess. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Fourthly, Solomon, as they suppose, calls it שונא, an "enemy" or "hater," Prov. xxv. 21. How properly they gather this name from that place "ipsi viderint." This I know, that to the same purpose it is called in the New Testament ἔχθρα, "enmity," or hatred, Rom. viii. 7; and all the effects of enmity, or actings of an enemy, שונא, are ascribed unto it, 1 Pet. ii. 11.

Fifthly, Isaiah calls it מכשול, "the offence" or "stumbling-block," Isa. lvii. 14; παράπτωμα, Rom. v. 18. See James i. 14, 15, the cause of our stumbling and falling.

Sixthly, Ezekiel calls it אבן, "a stone," chap. xxxvi. 26. The reason of this appellation is commonly known, neither doth any allusion better set out the *nature* of it from its effects. Καρδία σκληρὰ καὶ ἀμετανόητος, a "hard and impenitent heart," Rom. ii. 5.

Seventhly, Joel calls it, as they say, צפוני, that "hidden thing," chap. ii. 20; for so they interpret הַצְּפוֹנִי in that place: whereby they seem to intend that *darkness and deceitfulness* which are often ascribed unto it in the New Testament. And these names they largely comment upon. Now, though I shall not justify their deduction of them from the places mentioned,—which yet, some of them, are proper enough unto their purpose,—yet, as was said, the names themselves seem not unsuitable unto that description of it which we have in the New Testament. Besides, they speak elsewhere to the same purpose. In Neve Shalom, lib. x. cap. ix., they term it טומאת נחש, the "defilement of the serpent," see 2 Cor. xi. 3; and מלך זקן וכסיל, from Eccles. iv. 13, "An old and foolish king." So is that place interpreted in Midrash Coheleth. And this, as we observed before, answers what we are taught in the New Testament concerning the "reign" and "dominion" of sin, as also the name given it by the apostle of Παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, "The old man;" both being comprised in that expression, "An old and foolish king," though the text be wrested by them in their usual manner. And they give a *tolerable reason* in the same place of this appellation of "The old

man;" because, say they, it is joined unto a man in his infancy, continuing with him unto his old age; but the יצר הטוב, that is "the new man, or good concupiscence, comes not on our nature until the age of thirteen years." So the Midrash, feeling in the dark after that supply of grace which is so clearly revealed in the gospel. And in Tractat. Sanhedrim, fol. 91, they ask this question, יצר הרע אי מתי שולט באדם;—"From what time doth the evil concupiscence bear rule in a man? from the time of his birth, or from the time of his forming in the womb?" Rabbi answers, "From the time of his conception and forming in the womb." And this Kimchi, on Ps. li., illustrates by a similitude not altogether impertinent; as saith he, "He that sows a bitter berry, that bitterness becomes natural unto the tree and fruit that grows thereon." And this concupiscence, which is in the heart of man from his conception, they acknowledge to have proceeded originally from the sin of our first parents; for if it were implanted in him at his creation, it cannot be avoided but that God himself must be assigned as the principal efficient *cause* of all moral evil.

Unto this purpose speaks their late master in the preface to his book De Fragilitate. "Hæc vitiositas," saith he, "ex primorum parentum profecta crimine, contagioque, invasit utramque animæ rationalis facultatem, mentem qua apprehendimus, et voluntatem qua appetimus;"—"This vitiosity and contagion, proceeding from the sin of our first parents, hath invaded both the faculties of our rational souls, both the understanding and the will." And as for the continuance of this evil, or its abode in us, they express it in Bereshith Rabba: כל זמן שהצדיקים חיים הם נלחמים יצרן;—"So long as the righteous live, they wage war with their concupiscence." And they variously set forth the growth of it, where it is not corrected by grace. At first they say it is like a "spider's thread," but at last like a "cart rope:" from Isa. lix. 5, v. 18. And again, in the beginning it is like a stranger, then as a guest, but lastly as the master of the house: see James i. 14, 15. And according to their wonted manner, on Gen. iv. 7, where רֹבֵץ, of the masculine gender, is joined with חַטָּאת, of the feminine, they observe, in Bereshith Rabba, sect. 22, בתחלה היא יש כנקבה ואחר כך היא מתגבר כזכר;—"At first it is like a woman, but afterwards it waxeth strong like a man."

12. More *testimonies* of this nature, from the writings that are of authority amongst them, might be produced, but that these are sufficient unto our purpose. What we aim at is, to evidence their conviction of that manifold misery which came upon mankind on the *entrance of sin* into the world; and two things we have produced their suffrage and consent unto:—

First, *The change of the primitive condition of man, by his defection from the law of his creation.* This made him obnoxious, in his

whole person and all his concernments, to the displeasure and curse of God; to all the *evil* which in this world he feels, or fears in another; to death temporal and eternal. And hence did all the disorder which is in the universe arise. All this we have found them freely testifying unto. And this must be acknowledged by all men who will not brutishly deny what their own consciences dictate unto them, and what the condition of the whole lower world proclaims, or irrationally ascribe such things unto God as are utterly inconsistent with his wisdom, goodness, righteousness, and holiness. And,—

Secondly, We have manifested their acknowledgment that *a principle of sin or moral evil hath invaded the nature of man*, or that from the sin of our first parents there is an "evil concupiscence" in the heart of every man, continually and incessantly inclining the soul unto operations *suitable* unto it; that is, unto all moral evil whatever.

From both these it unavoidably follows, on the first notions of the righteousness, holiness, veracity, and faithfulness of God, that mankind in this estate and condition can justly expect nothing but a *confluence of evil* in this world, and at the close of their pilgrimage to perish with a ruin commensurate unto their existence. For God having, in wisdom and righteousness, as the sovereign Lord of his creatures, given them a *law*, good, just, and equal; and having appointed the *penalty* of death, and his everlasting displeasure therein, unto the *transgression* thereof; and withal having sufficiently promulgated both *law* and *penalty* (all which things we have before demonstrated); the transgression prohibited actually ensuing, God himself being judge, it remains that all this constitution of a law and threatening of a penalty was vain and ludicrous, as Satan in the *serpent* pretended, or that mankind is rendered absolutely miserable and cursed, and that for ever. Now, which of these is to be concluded, divine revelation in the Scripture, reason, and the event of things, will readily determine.

13. That God, without the least impeachment of his righteousness or goodness, might have left all mankind *remediless* in this condition, is manifest, both from what hath been discoursed concerning the means whereby they were brought into it, and his dealing with angels on the like occasion. The *condition* wherein man was created was morally good and upright; the *state* wherein he was placed, outwardly happy and blessed; the *law* given unto him, just and equal; the *reward* proposed unto him, glorious and sure; and his *defection* from this condition, voluntary. "What shall we say, then? is God unjust who inflicteth vengeance? God forbid." The execution of a righteous sentence, upon the voluntary transgression of a law just and equal, hath no unrighteousness in it. And this was the sum of what God did in this matter, as to the misery that came on mankind.

And who should judge him if he had left him for ever to "eat of the fruit of his own ways, and to be filled with his own devices?" He had before, as expressed his power and wisdom, so satisfied his goodness and bounty, in his creation, with his endowments and enjoyments according unto the law thereof; and what could man look for further at his hands?

Hence Adam, when his eyes were opened to see the nature of evil, in that actual sense which he had in his conscience of the guilt that he had contracted, had not the least expectation of relief or mercy; and the folly of the course which he took, in hiding himself, argues sufficiently both his present amazement and that he knew of nothing better to betake himself unto. Therefore doth he give that account of the result of his thoughts, as unto the relation that was between God and him, and what only he now looked for from him, "I heard thy voice, and I was afraid." Neither would any revelation that God had then made of himself, either by the works of his power and wisdom, or by any inbred impressions on the souls of men concreated with them, give encouragement unto them that had sinned against him to expect relief. Besides, he had dealt thus with angels. Upon their first sin, "he spared them not," but at once, without hope of recovery, cast them under the "chains of darkness," to be kept unto the final "judgment of the great day." On this our apostle discourseth unto the Hebrews, chap. ii. Now, God dealt not unsuitably unto any of the excellencies of his nature, when he left the apostatizing angels to perish without remedy unto eternity. Had he dealt so also with apostatizing mankind, who were drawn into a conspiracy against him by the head of the defection, his ways had still been holy and righteous.

14. Yet doth not this great instance of God's dealing with angels absolutely conclude his leaving of mankind remediless in their misery also. He might *justly* do so, but thence it doth not follow that *necessarily* he must do so. And although the chief, and indeed only reason of his extending grace and mercy unto *men*, and not unto *angels*, was his own sovereign will and pleasure, concerning which who can say unto him, "What doest thou?" yet there was such a difference between these two sorts of original transgressors as may manifest a *condecency* or suitableness unto his righteousness and goodness in his various proceeding with them; for there are sundry things that put an aggravation on the rebellion of *angels* above that of man, and some that render their ruin less destructive unto the glory of the universe than that of mankind would have been: for,—

First, The *angels* were created in an *estate and condition much superior* unto and more excellent than that of man; and so likewise were their present or actual *enjoyments* far above his, though these also were admirable and blessed. The place of their *first*

habitation, which they left, Jude 6, was the *highest heaven*, the most glorious receptacle of created beings; in opposition whereunto they are said to be cast into the *lowest hell*, 2 Pet. ii. 4: whereas *man* was placed in the *earth;* which, although then beautiful and excellently suited to his condition, yet was every way inferior unto the glory and lustre of the other, which God so had "garnished by his Spirit," Job xxvi. 13, and which, for its curious excellency, is called "the work of his fingers," Ps. viii. 3. And in these different places of their habitation,—

Secondly, Their several *employments* also did greatly differ. The work of angels was immediately to attend the throne of God, to minister before him, and to give glory unto him, and to execute the commands of his providence in the government of the works of his hands, Ps. lxviii. 17; Dan. vii. 10; Ezek. i. 5–14; Heb i. 14; Rev. v. 11;—the highest pitch of honour that a mere creature can be exalted unto. Man, during his natural life, was to be employed in tilling and dressing of the ground, Gen. ii. 15; a labour that would have been easy, useful, and suitable unto his condition, but yet, in honour, advantage, and satisfaction, unspeakably beneath the duty of the others.

Thirdly, Their *enjoyments* also greatly differed. For the angels enjoyed the immediate glorious presence of God, without any external created resemblances of it; when man was kept at a greater distance, and not admitted unto such immediate communion with God, or enjoyment of his glorious presence.

Now, all these, and the like considerations, although on the one side they do not in the least extenuate or excuse the sin and crime of man in his apostasy, yet they greatly aggravate the wickedness, ingratitude, and pride of the angels.

Moreover, they differed in their *intellectual perfections*, whereby they were enabled to discern the excellencies and to know the mind of God: for although man had all that light, knowledge, and wisdom concreated with him, and so natural unto him, which were any way needful to enable him unto a right and due performance of the obedience required of him, in the observance whereof he should have been brought unto the enjoyment of God; yet it came far short of that excellency of understanding and that piercing wisdom which was in those spiritual beings, which they were endowed withal to fit them for that near contemplation of the glory of God whereunto they were admitted, and that ready apprehension of his mind which they were to observe. And as these were in themselves, and ought to have been improved by themselves, as blessed means of preserving them in their obedience, so, being despised and neglected, they were a great aggravation of the wickedness of their apostasy. There was likewise,—

Fifthly, *A difference in the manner of their defection.* Man was circumvented by the craft and policy of the angels, who were made before him and sinned before him: and this, although he was furnished with an ability and power to have rejected and overcome, yet it had that influence into his sin and fall that the Holy Ghost affirms that our first parents were SEDUCED or "deceived," 1 Tim. ii. 14, 2 Cor. xi. 3; and therefore Satan is called their "murderer," John viii. 44. But the angels had nothing without them to excite, provoke, or lay snares for them; but of their own voluntary choice, and mere motion of their own mind, in the exercise of that freedom of their will which was bestowed on them for their own honour and advantage in their obedience, left their stations, and set up themselves in a way of opposition unto their Creator, who had exalted them above their companions, newly brought out of the same nothing with themselves, into a condition of the highest created glory imaginable. Again,—

Sixthly, Although the condition of mankind, being to be propagated by natural generation from one common stock, made it necessary that our first parents should have a greater trust reposed in them, by reason of their representation of their whole posterity in that covenant wherein they stood before God, than any angel could have, seeing they stood every one only in his own name and for himself, yet they were but *two persons* that actually sinned at first, and those one after another, one seduced by another; whereas the angels in *multitudes inconceivable,* by a joint conspiracy, at the same instant combined together against the authority and law of their Creator, and, as it should seem, appointed one among themselves for the head of their apostasy. Now, although, as was said, none of these things do, or can, in the least extenuate the sin of man, which was the product of inconceivable infidelity and ingratitude, yet they contain such aggravations of the sin of angels as may evidence a condecency unto divine wisdom and goodness in passing them by in their sin and misery unto eternity, and yet giving relief unto mankind.

Lastly, We may add unto what hath been spoken, *the concernment of the glory of God in the universe;* for if man had been left for ever without relief, the whole race or kind of creatures, partakers of *human nature,* had been utterly lost. Nothing of that kind could ever have come unto the enjoyment of God, nor could God have ever been glorified by them in a way of thankfulness and praise, which yet was the end why he made that sort of creatures; for the whole race of them as to the event would have been mere objects of wrath and displeasure. But in the fall of angels, they were only a certain number of individuals that sinned; the whole kind was not lost as to the first end of their creation. *Angelical*

nature was preserved, in its orderly dependence on God, in those millions that kept their obedience, and primitive condition thereon; which is continued unto them with a superaddition of glory and honour, as shall be elsewhere declared. God, then, having made himself two families unto his praise, amongst whom he would dwell, that above of angels, and this below of mankind, had sinning man,—which was the whole creation participating in human nature,—been utterly cast off, one family had been lost for ever, though so great a remnant of the other was preserved. Wherefore, as we shall afterwards see, it seemed good unto his infinite wisdom, as to preserve that portion of his superior family which sinned not, so to recover a portion of that below; and to make them up into one family, in one new head, his Son Jesus Christ; in whom he hath now actually gathered into one all things that are in heaven and earth, unto his praise and glory, Eph. i. 10.

It appears, then, that no certain conclusion can hence be drawn that man is left remediless in his sin and misery, because angels are so; seeing that although the whole cause of the difference made is to be referred unto the sovereign will, wisdom, and pleasure of God, yet there is that, appearing unto reason, which manifests a suitableness unto his excellencies in the distinction to be put between them.

15. There is, then, no *necessary reason* inducing us to believe that God hath left all mankind to perish in their sin and misery, under the curse, without any provision of a remedy; yea, there are on the other side evidences many and certain that there is a way provided for their recovery: for,—

First, The *glorious properties of the nature of God*, whose manifestation and exaltation in all the works that outwardly are of him he designeth, do require that there should be salvation for sinners. Even this matter of the salvation of sinners conduceth, yea, is necessary, unto the manifestation of some of those divine excellencies wherein no small part of the glory of God doth consist. God had, in the creation of all things, glorified his greatness, power, wisdom, and goodness. His sovereignty, righteousness, and holiness, he had in like manner revealed in that holy law which he had prescribed unto angels and men for the rule of their obedience, and in the assignation of their reward. Upon the sin of angels and men, he had made known his severity and vindictive *justice*, in the curse and punishment inflicted on them. But there were yet remaining undiscovered, in the abyss of his eternal essence, *grace* and *pardoning mercy;* which in none of his works had as yet exerted themselves or manifested their glory. And in case no remedy be provided for mankind under the evils mentioned, and their utter ruin, as they must have perished accordingly, so those glorious properties of the nature of God,—all ways of exerting their proper and peculiar acts

being secluded, all objects of them removed,—could not have been equally glorified with his other holy attributes. The creatures know nothing in God but as it is manifested in its effects. His essence in itself dwells in "light inaccessible." Had never any stood in need of grace and mercy, or, doing so, had never been made partakers of them, it could not have been known that there was that kind of goodness in his nature, which yet it is his design principally to glorify himself in. The *necessity*, therefore, of the manifestation of these properties of God, his goodness, grace, mercy, and readiness to forgive, which can only be exercised about sinners, and that in their relief and salvation from sin and misery, do require that the deliverance inquired after be admitted, and justly expected. And this *expectation* is so much the more just, and firmly grounded, in that there is nothing in himself which the Lord more requireth our conformity unto himself in, than in this condescension, goodness, grace, and readiness to forgive; which manifests how dear the glory of them is unto him.

Secondly, To what end shall we conceive the *providence and patience of God to be exercised* towards the race of mankind for so long a season in the earth? We see what is the general issue and event of the continuance of mankind in the world; God saw it and complained of it long ago, Gen. vi. 5, 6. Shall we now think that God hath no other design, in his patience towards mankind for so many generations, but merely to suffer them all and every one without exception to sin against him, dishonour him, provoke him, that so he may at length everlastingly destroy them? That this, indeed, is the event with many, with the most, through their own perverse wickedness, blindness, and love of the "pleasures of sin," cannot be denied; but to suppose that God hath no other design at all but merely by his patience to forbear them a while in their folly, and then to avenge himself upon them, is unsuitable unto his wisdom and goodness. It cannot be, then, but that he would long since have cut off the whole race, if there were no way for them to be delivered out of this perishing condition. And although this way, whatever it be, is not effectual towards all, yet for their sakes towards whom, through the grace of God, it is and shall be so, is the patience of God exercised towards the whole race of mankind, and their being is continued in this world. Other reason of this dispensation of divine wisdom and goodness can none be assigned.

Thirdly, That there is a *way of deliverance* for mankind, the event hath manifested in two remarkable and undeniable instances:—

First, In that *sundry persons* who were, as others, "by nature children of wrath," and under the curse, have obtained an undoubted and infallible interest in the love and favour of God, and this testimony, that "they pleased him." What were the assurances they had

hereof, I shall not now debate. But I take it now for granted,—which may be further confirmed as occasion shall require,—that some persons in all generations have enjoyed the friendship, love, and favour of God: which they could never have done unless there had been some way for their deliverance out of the state of sin and misery before described; for therein every man, upon a just account, will find himself in the state of Adam, who, when he heard the voice of God, was afraid.

Secondly, God hath been pleased to require from men a *revenue of glory, by a way of worship* prescribed unto them after the entrance of sin. This he hath not done unto the angels that sinned; nor could it have been done, in a consistency with righteousness, unto men, without a supposition of a possibility of deliverance from under his wrath: for in every prescription of duty God proposeth himself as a rewarder; which he is only unto them that please him, and to please God without the deliverance inquired after is impossible. Besides, that God is actually glorified in the world by the way of worship required on this supposition, shall be elsewhere declared, and arguments added in full measure to confirm our assertion.

Deliverance, then, from this condition may on just grounds be expected; and how it might be effected is our next inquiry.

16. The great relief inquired after must be brought about by *men themselves*, or by *some other* for them. What they can do themselves herein we may be quickly satisfied about. The nature of the evils under which they suffer, and the event of things in the world, sufficiently discover the disability of men to be their own deliverers. Besides, who should contrive the way of it for them? One single person? more? or all? How easily the impossibility of it might be demonstrated, on any of these suppositions, is too manifest to be insisted on. The evils suffered under are of two sorts, both universal and eternal. The first is that of *punishment*, inflicted from the righteousness of God.

There are but two ways possible (setting aside the consideration of what shall be afterwards fixed on) whereby mankind, or any individual person amongst them, may obtain deliverance from this evil; and the first is, that *God, without any further consideration, should remit it*, and exempt the creation from under it. But although this way may seem possible unto some, it is indeed utterly otherwise. Did not the sentence of it proceed from his righteousness and the essential rectitude of his nature? did he not engage his truth and faithfulness that it should be inflicted? and doth not his holiness and justice require that so it should be? What should become of his glory, what would he do unto his great name, if now, without any cause or reason, he should, contrary unto all these engagements of his holy perfections, wholly remit and take it off?

Nay, this would plainly justify the serpent in his calumny, that whatever he pretended, yet indeed no execution of his threatening would ever ensue. How, also, can it be supposed that any of his future comminations should have a just weight upon the souls of men, if that first great and fundamental one should be frustrated and evacuated? or what authority would be left unto his law when he himself should dissolve the sanction of it? Besides, if God should do thus,—which reason, revelation, and the event of things, do manifest that he neither would nor could (for he cannot deny himself),—this would have been his work, and not an acquisition of men themselves, which we are now inquiring after. So that this way of deliverance, as it is but imaginary, so it is here of no consideration.

There is no other way, then, for man, if he will not perish eternally under the punishment due unto his apostasy and rebellion, but, secondly, to find out some way of *commutation*, or making a recompense for the evil of sin unto the law and righteousness of God. But herein his utter insufficiency quickly manifests itself. Whatever he is, or hath, or can pretend any interest in, lies no less under the curse than he doth himself; and *that which is under the curse can contribute nothing unto its removal.* That which is, in its whole being, obnoxious unto the greatest punishment, can have nothing wherewithal to make commutation for it; for that must first be accepted, in and for itself, which can either make atonement, or be received for any other in exchange. And this is the condition of man, and of every individual of mankind, and will be so to eternity, unless relief arise from another place. It is further also evident, that all the endeavours of men must needs be unspeakably disproportionate unto the effect and end aimed at, from the concernment of the other parts of the creation in the curse against sin. What can they do to restore the universe unto its first glory and beauty? How can they reduce the creation unto its original harmony? Wherewith shall they recompense the great God for the defacing of so great a portion of that impress of his glory and goodness that he had enstamped on it? In a word, they who, from their first date unto their utmost period, are always under the punishment, can do nothing for the total removal of it. The experience also of five thousand years hath sufficiently evinced how insufficient man is to be a saviour unto himself. All the various and uncertain notions of Adam's posterity in religion, from the extremity of atheism unto that of sacrificing themselves and one another, have been destined in vain towards this end; neither can any of them, to this day, find out a better or more likely way for them to thrive in, than those wherewith their progenitors deluded themselves. And in the issue of all, we see, that as to what man hath been able of himself to do towards his own deliverance, both himself and the whole world are continued in the same

state wherein they were upon the first entrance of sin, cumulated, as it were, with another world of confusion, disorder, mischief, and misery.

There is also another head of the misery of man; and that is, the corrupt spring of *moral evil that is in his nature.* This also is universal and endless. It mixeth itself with all and every thing that man doth or can do as a moral agent, and that all ways and for ever, Gen. vi. 5. It is, then, impossible that it should have an end, unless it do either destroy or spend itself. But seeing it will do neither of these, *ever sinning,* which man cannot but be, is not the way to disentangle himself from sin.

17. If, then, any deliverance be ever obtained for mankind, it must be by some *other* [*being*], not involved in the same misery with themselves. This must either be God himself, or good angels. Other rational agents there are none. If we look to the latter, we must suppose them to undertake this work either by the appointment of God, or upon their own accord, without his previous command or direction. The latter cannot be supposed. They knew too much of the majesty, holiness, and terror of the great God, to venture on an interposition of themselves upon his counsels and ways uncommanded. To do so would have been a sinful dissolution of the law of their creation. So much, also, they might discern of the work itself as to stifle unto eternity every thought of engaging themselves into it. Besides, they knew the will of God, by what they saw come to pass. They saw his justice and holiness glorified, in the evils which he had brought upon the world. That he would not for ever satisfy himself in that glory, they knew not. And what was man unto them, that they should busy themselves to retrieve him from that condition whereinto he had cast himself by sin, finding Him glorified therein, in conformity unto whose will their happiness and perfection do consist? As remote as men are from thoughts of recovering fallen angels, so far were they from contriving the recovery of man.

But it may be said, that God himself might design them to work out the salvation and deliverance inquired after, as was before supposed. But this makes God, and not them, to be the Saviour, and them only the instruments in the accomplishment of his work. Neither yet hath he done so, nor were they meet so to be employed. Whatever is purely penal in the misery of man, is an effect of the righteous judgment of God. This, as we have manifested, could be no otherwise diverted from him but by the undergoing of it by some other in his stead. And two things are required in him or them that should so undergo it:—First, That *they were not themselves obnoxious* unto it, either *personally* or upon the first *common account.* Should they be so, they ought to look to their own concernment in the first place. Secondly, That they were such as that the *benefit* of their undergoing that penalty might, according to the

rules of justice, *redound unto them for whom and in whose stead they underwent it;* otherwise they would suffer in vain. Now, although the angels might answer the first of these, in their personal immunity from obnoxiousness unto the curse, yet the latter they were unsuited for. They had no relation unto mankind, but only that they were the workmanship of the same Creator. But this is not sufficient to warrant such a substitution. Had angels been to be delivered, their redemption must have been wrought in the angelical nature, as the apostle declares, Heb. ii. 16. But what justice is it, that *man* should sin and *angels* suffer? or from whence should it arise that, from their suffering, it should be righteous that he should go free? By what notions of God could we have been instructed in the wisdom and righteousness of such a proceeding? Add hereunto that this God hath not done, and we may safely conclude that it became him not so to do.

18. But what need all this inquiry? The Jews, with whom we principally have to do in this matter, plead constantly that God hath appointed unto men, at least unto themselves, a way and means of delivery out of this condition; and this is by the observation of Moses' law. By this they say they are justified in the sight of God, and have deliverance from all wrath due unto sin. This they trusted in of old, Rom. ix. 32; this they continue to make their refuge at this day. "Spiritualis liberatio solummodo dependet ab observatione legis quam Deus in Monte Sinai promulgavit;"—"Spiritual deliverance dependeth solely on the observation of the law which God promulgated on Mount Sinai," saith the author of the Answers unto certain Questions proposed to the Jews, quest. 5, published by Brenius;[1] who in his reply hath betrayed unto them the most important doctrines of the Christian religion. But this is their persuasion. The giving of this law unto them they suppose to have freed them utterly from every thing in the condition before described, so far as they will acknowledge it to concern any of the posterity of Adam. And whereas they cannot deny but that they sometimes sin against the moral precepts of this law, and so stand in need of help against their helper, they fix in this case upon a double relief. The first is that of their own *personal repentance;* and the other, the *sacrifices* that are appointed in the law.

But whereas they now are, and have been for many generations, deprived of the privilege, as they esteem it, of offering sacrifices according to the law, they hope that their own repentance, with their death, which they pray may be expiatory, will be sufficient to obtain for them the *forgiveness of sin.* Only, they say this might better and more easily be effected if they might enjoy the benefit of sacrifices. So saith the fore-mentioned Jew, whose dis-

[1] See note, vol. v. p. 296 of Owen's works.—Ed.

course is published by Brenius: "Quamvis jam nulla sint sacrificia, quæ media erant ad tanto facilius impetrandam remissionem peccatorum, eadem tamen per pœnitentiam et resipiscentiam impetratur." And again: "Hodie victimas offerre non possumus destituti mediis ad hoc necessariis, quæ quando obtinebimus, tum remissio illa tanto facilior reddetur," Respon. ad Quæst. Septim. If they cannot obtain the use of sacrifices, yet the matter may be effected by their repentance; only it were much easier to do it by sacrifices. And they seem to long for them principally on this account, that by them they may free themselves from somewhat of discipline and penance, which now their consciences enforce them unto. But this, as all other articles of their creed which are properly Judaical, is feigned by them, to suit their present condition and interest: for where do they find that their sacrifices,—especially that which they most trust in, namely, that on the feast of expiation, Lev. xvi.,—was ever designed for this end, to enable them the *more easily* to obtain the remission of sins by another means which they use? For it is said directly that the sacrifice on that day did expiate their sin, and make atonement for it, that they might not die; and not that it did help them in procuring pardon another way. But this is now taken from them, and what shall they do? Why, rather than they will look or come to Him who was represented in that sacrifice, and on whose account alone it had all its efficacy, they will find out a *new way* of doing that which their sacrifices were appointed unto; and this they must do, or openly acknowledge that they all perish eternally. I shall not insist long on the casting down of this imagination, all the foundations of it being long ago demolished by our apostle in his epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and the Hebrews themselves. And this he hath not done merely by a new revelation of the mind and will of God, but upon the principles and by the testimonies of the Old Testament itself, as will afterwards more fully appear. Only, because it is here set up in competition with that blessed and all-sufficient remedy against sin and the curse which God indeed hath provided, I shall briefly remove it out of our way, and that by manifesting that it is neither in itself suited unto that end, nor was ever of God designed thereunto.

19. That all mankind were cast into the condition we have described, by and upon the sin of Adam, we have before sufficiently confirmed. Other just reason or occasion of it no man can assign. It hath been also evinced that God *would*, and consequently *did*, prepare a remedy for them, or a way of deliverance to be proposed unto them. If this were only the law of Moses, and the observance thereof, as the Jews pretend, I desire to know what became of them, what was their estate and condition, who *lived and died before the giving of the law?* Not only the patriarchs before the flood, who

some of them had this testimony, that they pleased God, and one of whom was taken alive into heaven, but Abraham also himself, who received the promises, must, on this supposition, be excluded from a participation in the deliverance inquired after; for they observed not the law of Moses. What they dream about the making of their law before the foundation of the world, and the study of God therein, and that night and day, by day in the written law, and by night in the oral Cabala, is not to be mentioned when matters of importance unto the souls of men are under consideration.

But yet I may add, by the way, that neither this nor the like monstrous figments are invented or broached by them without some especial design. In the eighth chapter of the Proverbs there is mention of the Wisdom of God, and such a description given of it as allows not an essential property of his nature to be thereby intended. This is there said to be with God before the foundation of the world, his delight and companion; whence it appears that nothing but the eternal Word, Wisdom, and Son of God, can possibly be intended thereby. To avoid this testimony given unto his eternal subsistence, the Jews first invented this fable, that the law was "created before the world," and that the wisdom of it was that which God conversed with and delighted in. And I have often wondered at the censure of a learned Christian annotator upon the place. "Hæc," saith he, "de ea sapientia quæ in lege apparet exponunt Hebræi; et sane ei, si non soli, at præcipue hæc attributa conveniunt;" contrary to the faith of the church in all ages. It is true, on verse 22, and those that follow, he affirms they may be expounded by that of Philo de Coloniis: Ὁ λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν γένεσιν εἰληφότων, οὗ καθάπερ οἴακος ἐνειλημμένος ὁ τῶν ὅλων κυβερνήτης πηδαλιουχεῖ τὰ σύμπαντα, καὶ ὅτε ἐκοσμοπλάστει χρησάμενος ὀργάνῳ τούτῳ πρὸς τὴν ἀνυπαίτιον τῶν ἀποτελουμένων σύστασιν. But whether this Platonical declaration of the nature and work of the Word of God, employed by him as an instrument in the making and government of the world, would have been accepted in the primitive church, when this place was vexed by the Arians, and studiously vindicated by the orthodox fathers, I much question. But to return: if the law, and the observance of it, be the only remedy provided of God against the sin and misery of man, the only means of reconciliation with him, all that died before the giving of it must perish, and that eternally. But the contrary appears from this very consideration, and is undeniably proved by our apostle in the instance of Abraham, Gal. iii. 17: for he received the promise and was taken into covenant with God four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law; and that covenant conveyed unto him the love and favour of God, with deliverance from sin and the curse; as themselves will not deny.

There was therefore a remedy in this case provided long before

the giving of the law on Mount Sinai; and therefore the law was not given unto that purpose, but for other ends, at large declared by our apostle. Either, then, they must grant that all the patriarchs, and he in especial of whom they boast, perished eternally, or else that there was a means of deliverance provided before the giving of the law; and, consequently, that the law was not given for that end. The first they will not do, nor can, without an absolute renunciation of their own sacred writings, wherein none have obtained a larger testimony that they pleased God than they. The latter, therefore, followeth undeniably. If they shall say they had a way of deliverance, but God provided another afterwards, as this would be spoken without warrant or authority from the Scripture, so I desire to know both what that way was, and why it was rejected. Of God's appointment it was, and effectual it was unto them that embraced it, and why it should be laid aside who can declare?

20. Again, as was before observed, there are two parts of the law,—the *moral precepts* of it, and the *instituted worship* appointed in it. Unto this latter part do the sacrifices of it belong. But neither of these are sufficient unto the end proposed, nor jointly can they attain it. Two things are evidently necessary, from what hath been discoursed, unto the deliverance inquired after,—first, That *man be reconciled unto God*, by the removal of the curse and the wrath due unto him for his apostasy; secondly, That *his nature be freed from that principle of sin* and *enmity against God* (the evil figment) that it is tainted, yea, possessed withal. And neither of these can be effected by the law, or either part of it; for,—

First, The *moral precepts* of it are the same with those that were written in the heart of man by nature, or *the law of his creation*, which he transgressed in his first rebellion. And he must be delivered from that guilt before any new obedience can be accepted of him. His *old debt* must be satisfied for before he can treat for a *new reward*, which inseparably follows all acceptable obedience. But this the precepts of the law take no notice of, nor direct unto any way for its removal; only, supposing the doing of it by some other means, it requires exact obedience in them that come to God thereby. Hence our apostle concludes that it could not give life, but was weak and insufficient in itself unto any such purpose. Besides,—

Secondly, It could not absolutely preserve men in its own observation; for it required that obedience which never any sinner did or could in all things perform, as the scriptures of the Old Testament abundantly manifest. For they tell us, "there is no man that sinneth not," 1 Kings viii. 46, 2 Chron. vi. 36; that "if the LORD should mark iniquity, no man could stand," Ps. cxxx. 3; and that "if he enter into judgment" (according to the law), "no man living can be justified in his sight," Ps. cxliii. 2. To this purpose see the ex-

cellent discourse and invincible reasonings of our apostle, Rom. iii. iv. This the holy men of old confessed; this the Scripture bears testimony unto; and this experience confirms, seeing every sin and transgression of that law was put under a curse, Deut. xxvii. 26. Where, then, "there is no man that sinneth not," and every sin is put under the curse, the law, in the preceptive part of it, can be no means of delivery from the one or other, but is rather a certain means of increasing and aggravating of them both. Neither is there any testimony given, concerning any one under the old testament, that he was any other way justified before God but *by faith and the pardon of sins*, which are not of the works of the law. See Gen. xv. 6; Ps. xxxii. 1, 2. Of Noah, indeed, it is said that he was "upright" and "perfect in his generations;" that is, sincere in his obedience, and free from the open wickedness of the age wherein he lived: but as this was before the giving of the law by Moses, so the ground of his freedom and deliverance is added to be the *gracious love* and favour of God. This the Jews themselves confess in the Bereshith Rabba, sect. 29: אפילו נח שנשתיר מהן לא היה כדאי אלא שמצא חן בעיני יי';—"Even Noah himself, who was left of them, was not every way as he should be, but that he found grace or favour in the eyes of the Lord." And to the same purpose they speak concerning Abraham himself elsewhere: אתה מוצא שלא יירש אברהם אבינו העולם הזה ועולם הבא אלא בזכות האמונה שנא' האמין ביי';—"Thou findest that Abraham our father inherited not this world and the world to come any otherwise than by faith: as it is said, 'He believed God.'" This part, therefore, of the law is plainly convinced to be insufficient to deliver sinners from an antecedent guilt, and curse due thereunto.

21. It remains, then, that the *sacrifices of the law* must yield the relief inquired after, or we are still at a loss in this matter. And these the Jews would willingly place their chief confidence in; they did so of old. Since, indeed, they have been driven from their observation, they have betaken themselves unto other helps, that they might not appear to be utterly hopeless. But they sufficiently manifest their great reserve against the accusation of their consciences to be in them, by the ludicrous ways of representing or rather counterfeiting of them that they have invented. גֶּבֶר signifies a "man;" and among the rabbins a "cock" also. Hence Ben Uzziel renders עֶצְיֹן גָּבֶר, "Ezion-geber," the name of a city, Deut. ii. 8, כרך תרנגולא, "The city of a cock;" and Isa. xxii. 17, גֶּבֶר is rendered by Jerome, "Gallus gallinaceus." Granting, therefore, that the punishment of Geber is required unto atonement and reconciliation, and that some such thing was signified in their sacrifices, they do, each one for himself, torture, slay, and offer a cock on the day of expiation, to make atonement for their sins, and that unto the devil. The rites of that diabolical solemnity are declared at large by Buxtorf, in his

Synagog. Judaic. cap. xxv. But yet, as this folly manifests that they can find no rest in their consciences without their sacrifices, so it gives them not at all what they seek after. And therefore, being driven from all other hopes, they trust at length unto their *own death*, for in life they have no hope; making this one of their constant prayers, "Let my death be the expiation of all sins." But this is the curse, and so no means to avoid it. Omitting, therefore, these horrid follies of men under despair,—an effect of that wrath which is come upon them unto the uttermost,—the thing itself may be considered.

That the sacrifices of Moses' law, in and by themselves, should be a means to deliver men from the guilt of sin, and to reconcile them unto God, is contrary to the *light of nature*, their *own proper use*, and *express testimonies of the Old Testament;* for,—First, Can any man think it reasonable that the blood of bulls and goats should, of itself, make an expiation for the sin of the souls of men, reconcile them to God the judge of all, and impart unto them an everlasting righteousness? Our apostle declares the manifest impossibility hereof, Heb. x. 4. They must have very mean and low thoughts of God, his holiness, justice, truth, of the demerit of sin, of heaven and hell, who think them all to depend on the blood of a calf or a goat. The sacrifices of them, indeed, might, by God's appointment, represent that to the minds of men which is effectual unto the whole end of appeasing God's justice, and of obtaining his favour; but that they should themselves effect it, is unsuitable unto all the apprehensions which are inbred in the heart of man either concerning the nature of God or the guilt of sin. Secondly, Their primitive and proper use doth manifest the same; for they were to be frequently *repeated*, and in all the repetitions of them there was still new mention made of sin. They could not, therefore, by themselves, take it away; for if they could, they would not have been reiterated. It is apparent, therefore, that their use was to represent and bring to remembrance that which did perfectly take away sin. For a *perfect work* may be often *remembered*, but it need not, it cannot be often *done;* for being done for such an end, and that end being obtained, it cannot be done again. The sacrifices, therefore, were never appointed, never used to take away sin, which they did not; but to represent that which did so effectually. Besides, there were some sins that men may be guilty of, whom God will not utterly reject, for which there was no sacrifice appointed in the law of Moses; as was the case with David, Ps. li. 16: which makes it undeniable that there was some other way of atonement besides them and beyond them, as our apostle declares, Acts xiii. 38, 39. Thirdly, The Scripture expressly rejects all the sacrifices of the law, when they are trusted in for any such end and purpose; which sufficiently demonstrates that they were never appointed thereunto. See Ps. xl. 6–8, l. 8–13; Isa. i. 11–13,

lxvi. 3; Amos v. 21, 22; Mic. vi. 6–8; and other places innumerable.

22. Add unto what hath been spoken, that during the observation of the whole law of Moses, whilst it was in force by the appointment of God himself, he still directed those who sought for acceptance with him unto a *new covenant of grace*, whose benefits by faith they were then made partakers of, and whose nature was afterwards more fully to be declared. See Jer. xxxi. 31–34, with the inferences of our apostle thereon, Heb. viii. 13. And this plainly everts the whole foundation of the Jews' expectation of justification before God on the account of the law of Moses given on Mount Sinai; for to what purpose should God call them from resting on the covenant thereof, to look for mercy and grace in and by another, if that had been able to give them the help desired?

In brief, then, the Jews fixing on the law of Moses as the only means of delivery from sin and death, as they do thereby exclude all mankind besides themselves from any interest in the love, favour, or grace of God,—which they greatly design and desire,—so they cast themselves also into a miserable, restless, self-condemned condition in this world, by trusting to that which will not relieve them; and into endless misery hereafter, by refusing that which effectually would make them heirs of salvation: for whilst they perish in their sin, another, better, more glorious, and sure remedy against all the evils that are come upon mankind, or are justly feared to be coming by any of them, is provided, in the grace, wisdom, and love of God, as shall now further be demonstrated.

23. The first intimation that God gave of this work of his grace in redeeming mankind from sin and misery, is contained in the *promise* subjoined unto the curse denounced against our first parents, and their posterity in them: Gen. iii. 15, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, and the serpent shall bruise his heel." Two things there are contained in these words;—*a promise of relief* from the misery brought on mankind by the temptation of Satan; and an *intimation of the means or way* whereby it should be brought about. That the first is included in these words is evident; for,—

First, If there be not a promise of deliverance expressed in these words, whence is it that the execution of the sentence of death against sin is suspended? Unless we will allow an *intervention* satisfactory to the righteousness and truth of God to be expressed in these words, there would have been a truth in the suggestion of the serpent, namely, that whatever God had said, yet indeed they were not to die. The Jews, in the Midrash Tehillim,—as Kimchi informs us on Ps xcii., whose title is, "A Psalm for the Sabbath-day," which they generally assign unto Adam,—say that Adam was cast

out of the garden of Eden on the evening of the sixth day, after which God came to execute the sentence of death upon him; but the Sabbath being come on, the punishment was deferred, whereon Adam made that psalm for the Sabbath-day. Without an interposition of some external cause and reason, they acknowledge that death ought immediately to have been inflicted; and other besides what is mentioned in these words there was none.

Secondly, The whole evil of sin, and curse, that mankind then did, or was to, suffer under, proceeded from the *friendship* contracted between the woman and the serpent, and her fixing faith in him. God here declares that he will break that league, and put enmity between them. Being now both of them under the same condition of sin and curse, this could not be without a change of condition in one of them. Satan is not divided from himself, nor is at enmity with them that are left wholly in his estate. A change of condition, therefore, on the part of the woman and her seed is plainly promised; that is, by a deliverance from the state of sin and misery wherein they were. Without this the enmity mentioned could not have ensued.

Thirdly, In pursuit of this enmity, the Seed of the woman was to *bruise the head of the serpent.* The head is the seat of his power and craft. Without the destruction of the evil and pernicious effects which by his counsel he had brought about, his head cannot be bruised. By his head he had contrived the ruin of mankind; and without the destruction of his works and a recovery from that ruin, he is not conquered nor his head bruised. And as these things, though they may now seem somewhat obscurely expressed in these words, are yet made plain unto us in the gospel, so the importance of them was evident unto our first parents of old, being expounded by all the circumstances wherewith the matter of fact was attended.

Again, there is an intimation of the *manner* how this work shall be performed. This, first, God takes upon himself: 'I will do it; "I will put enmity."' It is an issue of his sovereign wisdom and grace. But, secondly, he will do it in and by the nature of man, "the Seed of the woman." And two things must concur to the effecting of it; —first, That this Seed of the woman must conquer Satan, bruise his head, destroy his works, and procure deliverance for mankind thereby; secondly, That he must suffer from, and by the means of, Satan in his so doing,—the serpent must "bruise his heel." This is the remedy and relief that God hath provided for mankind. And this is the MESSIAH, or God joining with the nature of man to deliver mankind from sin and eternal misery.

24. This promise of relief by the Seed of the woman is, as the first, so the only intimation that God gave unto our first parents of a way of deliverance from that condition whereinto they, and the

whole creation, were brought by the entrance of evil or sin. It was likewise the first discovery that there was in him רָצוֹן, רַחֲמִים, כְּלִיחָה, חֶסֶד, חֵן,—benignity, grace, kindness, or mercy, compassion, pardon. Hereby he declared himself to be אֱלוֹהַּ סְלִיחוֹת חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם, Neh. ix. 17, —"a God of pardons, gracious, and tenderly merciful;" as also, Ps. lxxxvi. 5, טוֹב וְסַלָּח וְרַב־חֶסֶד,—"good and pardoning, and much in mercy." And if this be not acknowledged, it must be confessed that all the world, at least unto the flood, if not unto the days of Abraham,—in which space of time we have testimony concerning some that they walked with God, and pleased him,—were left without any certain ground of faith, or hope of acceptance with him; for without some knowledge of this mercy, and the provision of a way for its exercise, they could have no such persuasion. This, then, we have obtained, that God, presently upon the entrance of sin into the world, and the breach of its public peace thereby, promised a reparation of that evil, in the whole extent of it, to be wrought in and by the Seed of the woman,—that is, the Messiah.

25. According unto our design, we may take along with us the thoughts of the Jews in this matter, expressed after their manner.

[As] for the serpent that tempted Eve, who is here threatened as the head of all the evil that ensued thereon, they confess that Satan accompanied him, and was principally intended in the curse denounced against him. So the Targum of Ben Uzziel: "When the serpent came to tempt Eve, she saw סמאל מלאך מותא,—Samael the angel of death upon him." And Maimonides gives a large account of the doctrine of their wise men in this matter, More Nebuch. pag. 2, cap. xx.: "At neque hoc prætereundum quod in Midrash adducunt sapientes nostri, serpentem equitatum fuisse, quantitatem ejus instar cameli, et sessorem ejus fuisse illum qui decepit Evam, hunicque sessorem fuisse Samaelem, quod nomen absolute usurpant de Satana. Invenies enim quod in multis locis dicunt Satanam voluisse impedire Abrahamum ne ligaret Isaacum, sic voluisse impedire Isaacum ne obsequeretur voluntati patris sui; alibi vero in hoc eodem negotio dicunt, venit Samael ad Abrahamum. Sic itaque apparet quod Samael sit ipse Satan." To omit their fables, this is evident, that they acknowledge it was Satan who deceived Eve. And in Bereshith Rabba, sect. 10, they give an account why God expostulated with Adam and Eve before he pronounced sentence against them, but without any word or question proceeded immediately unto the doom of the serpent; for say they, "The holy, blessed God said, נחש זה רשע בעל תשובות ואם אני אומר לו עכשיו הוא אומר לי את צוית אותם ואני צוייתי אותם מפני מה הניחו הלכו להם אחרו צווי אלא קפין עליו ופסק לו את דין;—"This serpent is wicked, and a cunning disputer, and if I speak unto him, he will straightway say, 'Thou gavest them a commandment, and I gave them a commandment; why

did they leave thy commandment and follow my commandment?' and therefore he presently pronounced sentence against him." And the same words are repeated in Midrash Vaiikra, ad cap. xiii. 2; which things can be understood of Satan only. I know some of the later masters have other thoughts of these things, because they discover what use may be made of the truth and the faith of their forefathers in this matter.

Aben Ezra, in his commentary on this place, disputes the opinions of their doctors; and although he acknowledges that Rabbi Saadias Haggaon, and Rabbi Samuel Ben Hophni, with others (that is, indeed, their Targums, and Talmuds, and all their ancient writings), affirm Satan to be intended, yet he contends for the serpent only; on the weak pretences, that Satan goeth not on his belly, nor eateth dust, which things in the letter are confessed to belong unto the instrument that he used. And hereon they would have it that the serpent was deprived of voice and understanding, which before he had; so making him a rational subsistence who is expressly reckoned amongst the beasts of the field.

The root of all evil, also, they would have to lie in *the matter whereof we were originally made;* an impossible figment, invented to reflect the guilt of all sin on Him that made us. Thus every thing seems right to them that will serve the present turn, whilst they shut their eyes against the truth. But we have the consent of the ancientest, best, and wisest of them in this matter, as also unto the deliverance here promised. The two Targums, [that] of Ben Uzziel, and that called Jerusalem, both agree that these words contain a remedy of the effects of Satan's temptation, and that to be wrought by the Messiah, or, as they speak, "in his days." And hence they have a common saying, that "in the last days" (which is the Old Testament periphrasis for the days of the Messiah), "all things shall be healed but the serpent and the Gibeonites;" by whom they understand all hypocrites and unbelievers. Satan, therefore, is to be conquered by the "bruising of his head;" and conquered he is not, nor can be, unless his work be destroyed. In the destruction of his work consists the delivery of mankind from the twofold evil mentioned; and this is to be effected by "the Seed of the woman," to be brought forth into the world unto that end and purpose: for when the production of this Seed is restrained unto the family and posterity of Abraham, it is said expressly that in, or by it, all the kindreds of the earth should be blessed; which they could not be without a removal and taking away of the curse.

26. We may now, therefore, take the sum of this discourse, and of the whole matter that we have insisted on, about the entrance of sin into the world, and the remedy provided in the grace and wisdom of God against it. It appears, upon our inquiry, First, That the

sin of our first parents was the occasion and cause of all that evil which is in the world,—of all that is felt or justly feared by mankind; for as those who knew not, or received not, the revelation of the truth in these things made unto us in the Scripture, could never assign any other cause of it that might be satisfactory unto an ordinary rational inquirer, so the testimonies of the Scripture make it most evident, and especially that insisted on. Secondly, It hath been evinced that mankind could not recover or deliver themselves from under the power of their own innate corruption and disorder, nor from the effects of the curse and wrath of God that came upon them; neither is there any ground of expectation of relief from any other part of God's creation: but yet, that God, for the praise of the glory of his grace, mercy, and goodness, would effect it and bring it about. Thirdly, That this relief and deliverance is first intimated and declared in these words of God unto the serpent, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel;" which appears,—

First, Because, in and with the serpent, Satan, who was the head of all apostasy from God, and by whom our first parents were beguiled, is intended in these words. This we have made evident from the confession of the Jews, with whom principally, in this matter, we have to do. And to what hath been already observed unto that purpose, we may add the testimonies of some other of them to the same purpose. Rabbi Bechai, he whom they call בחיי זקן, "Bechai the elder," in his comment on the law, upon these words, Gen. iii. 15, speaks to this purpose: "We have no more enmity with the serpent than with other creeping things. Wherefore the Scripture mystically signifies him who was hid in the serpent; for the body of the crafty serpent was a fit instrument for that force or virtue that joined itself therewithal. That was it which made Eve to sin; whence death came on all her posterity. And this is the enmity between the serpent and the seed of the woman; and this is the mystery of the holy tongue, that the serpent is sometimes called Saraph, according to the name of an angel who is also called Saraph. And now thou knowest that the serpent is Satan, and the evil figment, and the angel of death." And Rabbi Judah, in כלי יקר: "Many interpreters say that the evil figment hath all its force from the old serpent, or Satan." To the same purpose, the author of כפתור ופרח, "Caphtor Vapærach:" "The devil and the serpent are called by one name." And many other testimonies of the like importance might be collected out of them.

We have also a surer word for our own satisfaction, in the application of this place unto Satan in the *divine writings of the New Testament:* as 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Rom. v. 11–13, 15; Heb.

ii. 14, 15; 1 John iii. 8; Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2, 3; but we forbear to press them on the Jews.

Besides, it is most evident from the thing itself; for,—first, Who can be so sottish as to imagine that this great alteration which ensued on the works of God, that which caused him to pronounce them accursed, and to inflict so sore a punishment on Adam and all his posterity, should arise from the actings of a *brute creature?* Where is the glory of this dispensation? How can we attribute it unto the wisdom and greatness of God? What is there in it suitable unto his righteousness and holiness? Whereas supposing this to be the work of him who was in himself the beginning of all apostasy, and who first brake the law of his creation, all things answer the excellency of the divine perfections. Moreover, is it imaginable that the nature of man, then flourishing in the vigour of all its intellectual abilities, reason, wisdom, knowledge, in that order and rectitude of them which was his grace, should be surprised, seduced, and brought into subjection unto the craft and machinations of an inferior creature, a beast of the field, and that unto its own ruin, temporal and eternal? The whole nature of the inferior creatures, James tells us, "is tamed by the nature of man," chap. iii. 7, and that now, in his lessened and depraved condition; and shall we think that this excellent nature, in the blossom of its strength and right unto rule over all, should be tamed, corrupted, subdued, by the nature of a beast or a serpent? And yet again, whereas in the whole action of the serpent, there is an open design against the glory and honour of God, with the welfare and happiness of mankind, and that managed with craft, subtlety, and forecast, how can we imagine that such a contrivance should befall a brute worm, incapable of moral evil, and newly framed out of the dust by the power of its Creator? Hitherto it had continued under the law, and order, of its creation; and shall we now think that suddenly, in an instant, it should engage thus desperately against God and man? And further, the actings of the serpent were by reason and with speech; and doth not a supposal that he was endowed with them plainly exempt him from that order and kind of creatures whereof he was, and place him among the number of the intellectual and rational parts of the creation? And is not this contrary to the analogy of the Scripture and the open truth of the thing itself, he being cursed among "the beasts of the field?" To say, as Aben Ezra seems to do, that God gave him reason and speech for that occasion, is blasphemously to make God the sole author of that temptation which he so much abhorred. Lastly, considering the punishment denounced against mankind, of death temporal and eternal, that which is threatened unto the serpent bears no proportion unto it, if it concern only the serpent itself; and what rule of justice will admit that the accessary should be punished

with greater sufferings than the principal? Neither doth this punishment, as to the principal part of it, the bruising of the head, befall all serpents, yea, but few of them in comparison,—doubtless not one in a million; whereas all mankind, none excepted, were liable unto the penalty denounced against them. Were no more men intended herein than are bitten on the heel by serpents, the matter were otherwise; but "death is passed upon all men, for all have sinned." Satan, then, it was who was the principal in this seduction, the author of all apostasy from God, who, using the serpent as his instrument, involved that also so far in the curse, as to render it of all creatures the most abhorred of mankind.

27. Against this seducer it is denounced that "his head should be bruised." The head of Satan is his craft and power. From these issued all that evil whereinto mankind was fallen. In the bruising, therefore, of his head, the defeat of his counsel, the destruction of his work, and the deliverance of mankind, are contained, as our apostle most excellently declares, Heb. ii. Death must be removed, and righteousness brought in, and acceptance with God procured, or the head of Satan is not bruised. This, therefore, is openly and plainly a promise of the deliverance inquired after.

Moreover, there is a declaration made how this victory shall be obtained and this deliverance wrought; and that is by the "seed of the woman." This seed is twice repeated in the words: once expressly, "and her seed;" and, secondly, it is included in the pronoun הוּא, "it." And as by "seed," in the first place, the posterity of the woman, some to be born of her race, partakers of human nature, may be intended, as the subjects of the enmity mentioned; so in the latter some *single person*, some *one* of her posterity or seed, that should obtain the victory, is expressly denoted: for as all her seed in common do never go about this work, the greatest part of them continuing in a willing subjection unto Satan, so if all of them should combine to attempt it, they would never be able to accomplish it, as we have before proved at large. Some one, therefore, to come of her, with whom God would be present in an especial and extraordinary manner, is here expressly promised; and this is the Messiah.

28. God having, in infinite wisdom and grace, provided this way of relief, and given this intimation of it, that *revelation* became the foundation and centre of all the *religion* that ensued in the world: for as those who received it by faith, and adhered unto it, continued in the worship of the true God, expressing their faith in the sacrifices that he had appointed typically to represent and exemplify before their eyes the work itself, which by the promised Seed was to be accomplished; so also all that false worship which the generality of mankind apostatized unto was laid in a general persuasion that there was a way for the recovery of the favour of God, but what

that was they knew not, and therefore wandered in woful uncertainties.

Some suppose that our great mother Eve, in these words, Gen. iv. 1, קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה, expressed an apprehension that she had born him who was Man-God, "the Man the LORD," the promised Seed. And they do not only contend for this meaning of the words, but also reproach them who are otherwise minded; as may be seen in the writings of Hunnius and Helvicus against Calvin, Junius, Paræus, and Piscator. That she, together with Adam, believed the promise, had the consolation, and served God in the faith of it, I no way doubt; but that she had an apprehension that the promised Seed should be so soon exhibited, and knew that he should be the LORD, or Jehovah, and yet knew not that he was to be born of a virgin, and not after the ordinary way of mankind, I see no cogent reason to evince. Nor do the words mentioned necessarily prove any such apprehension in her. The whole weight of that supposition lies on the construction of the words, from the interposition of the particle אֶת, denoting, as they say, after verbs active always an accusative case. But instances may be given to the contrary; whence our translation reads the words, "I have gotten a man from the LORD," without the least intimation of any other sense in the original. And Drusius is bold to affirm that it is want of *solid skill* in the sacred tongue that was the cause of that conception. Besides, if she had such thoughts, she was manifoldly mistaken; and to what end that mistake of hers should be here expressed I know not. And yet, notwithstanding all this, I will not deny but that the expression is unusual and extraordinary, if the sense of our translation be intended, and not that by some contended for, "I have gotten," or obtained, "the Man the LORD." And this, it is possible, caused Jonathan Ben Uzziel to give us that gloss on the words in his Targum: ואדם ידע את חוה אתתיה דהוא חמידת למלאכא ואעדיאת וילידת ית קין ואמרת קניתי לגברא ית מלאכא דיי;—"And Adam knew his wife Eve, who desired the Angel; and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, 'I have obtained the man' (or 'a man') 'the Angel of the LORD;' "—that is, him who was promised afterwards under the name of "The Angel of the LORD," or "The Angel of the covenant;" which the Jews may do well to consider.

29. But we have further expositions of this first promise and further confirmations of this grace in the Scripture itself: for in process of time it was renewed unto Abraham, and the accomplishment of it confined unto his family; for his gratuitous call from superstition and idolatry, with the separation of him and his posterity from all the families of the earth, was subservient only unto the fulfilling of the promise before treated of. The first mention of it we have Gen. xii. 1–3, "Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of

thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." And this is again expressed, chap. xviii. 18, "All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him;" and chap. xxii. 18, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." And when he doubted of the accomplishment of this promise because he was childless, and said, "Behold, to me thou hast given no seed," as knowing that therein lay the promise, chap. xv. 3, God tells him that "he who should come forth of his own bowels should be his heir," verse 4; which was afterwards restrained unto Isaac, chap. xvii. 21. Thus he is called and separated, as from his own family and kindred, so from all other nations, and a *peculiar portion* of the earth assigned unto him and his for their habitation. Now, the especial end of this divine dispensation, of this call and separation of Abraham, was to be a means of accomplishing the former promise, or the bringing forth of Him who was to be the deliverer of mankind from the curse that was come upon them for their sin; for,—

First, It is said that Abraham hereupon should be "a blessing:" וְהֱיֵה בְּרָכָה, "And thou shalt be a blessing;"—'Not only blessed thyself' (which is expressed in the former words, "I will bless thee"), 'but the means of conveying blessings, the *great blessing*, unto others.' And how was this done in and by Abraham? In his own person he conversed with but few of them, unto some whereof, through their own sins, he was an occasion of punishment; as to the Egyptians, chap. xii. 17, and to the Philistines, chap. xx. 4, 7. Some he destroyed with the sword, chap. xiv. 15; and he was not in any thing signally a *blessing* unto any of them. So his posterity extirpated sundry nations from the face of the earth, were a scourge unto others, and occasioned the ruin of many more. He must needs, then, be made a blessing unto the world on some other account; and this can be nothing but that he was separated to be the peculiar channel by which the promised blessing, the Seed, should be brought forth into the world.

Secondly, It is said that "all the families of the earth should be blessed in him," chap. xii. 3; that is, not in his person, but in his seed, as it is expounded chap. xxii. 18,—that is, in the promised Seed that should come of him; chap. xii. 3, נִבְרְכוּ, "shall be blessed," in the passive conjugation of Niphal, referring solely unto the grace and favour of God in giving the Seed; chap. xxii. 18, הִתְבָּרְכוּ, in Hithpael, so blessed in the Seed, when exhibited, as that they shall come for the blessing by faith; and, so in him obtaining it, bless themselves. And this is spoken of "all families, all nations," the posterity of Adam

in general. They were all cursed in Adam, as hath been declared; and God here promiseth that they shall be blessed in the seed of Abraham, and by him the Seed of the woman. And this blessing must inwrap in it all the good things whereof by the curse they were deprived, or it will be of no use or benefit unto them; a blessing, indeed, it will not be. For a while he intended to leave mankind to walk in their own ways; partly that he might show his severity against sin; partly that he might evidence the *sovereignty* and undeserved freedom of that grace wherein he had provided a Deliverer; and partly that they might try and experiment their own wisdom and strength in searching after a way of deliverance. But in this promise was the ore laid up, which, after many generations, was brought forth and stamped with the image of God.

Thirdly, The curse unto Satan is here again renewed: "I will bless them that bless thee, and I will curse HIM that curseth thee." The blessing is to *many;* but the curse respecteth *one* principally, that is, Satan, as the Scripture generally expresseth the opposite apostate power under that name. Neither is there any just cause of the variation of the number, unless we look on the words as a pursuit of the first promise, which was accompanied with an especial malediction on Satan, who acts his enmity in all obloquy and cursing against the blessed Seed and those that are blessed therein. And this change of the number in these words is observed by Aben Ezra: מברכיך רבים: ומקללך יחיד,—"'They that bless thee,' many; 'He that curseth,' one;" as though many should bless, and few curse, the contrary whereof is true. And Baal Hatturim: מברכיך לשון רבים: מקללך לשון יחיד,—"'They that bless thee,' in the plural number; 'He that curseth thee,' in the singular." And an interpretation is given of the last words becoming those annotations, which are immeasurably Judaical, that is, sottish and superstitious: מקללך אאר בגימטריא בלעם הבא לקלל בניך,—"'He that curseth thee, I will curse;'—that is, by gematry, 'Balaam, that cometh to curse thy sons;'" the numeral letters of each making up 422: of which fantastical work amongst some of them there is no end. But *one single person* (in which way Satan is usually spoken of) they saw to be intended; which is passed over, as far as I have observed, by Christian expositors.

30. After the giving of this promise, the whole Old Testament beareth witness that a person was to be born, of the posterity of Abraham, in and by whom the nations of the earth should be saved; that is, delivered from sin and curse, and made eternally happy. Abraham himself died without one foot of an inheritance in this world, nor did he concern himself personally in the nations of the earth beyond his own family; another, therefore, is to be looked for in whom they may be blessed. And this we must further demonstrate, to evince the perverseness of the Jews, who exclude all

others besides themselves from an interest in these promises made to Abraham, at least unless they will come into subjection unto them and dependence upon them; so high conceits have they yet of themselves in their low and miserable condition! The next time, therefore, that he is mentioned in the Scripture, it is said, לוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים, "To him shall be the gathering of the peoples," Gen. xlix. 10; concerning which place we must treat afterwards at large. The people of the world, distinct from Judah, shall gather themselves unto him; that is, for safety and deliverance, or to be made partakers of the promised blessing.

Hence Balaam among the Gentiles prophesied of him, Num. xxiv. 17, 19; and Job, among the children of the east that were not of the posterity of Isaac, professed his faith in him, chap. xix. 25, וְאֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי גֹּאֲלִי חַי וְאַחֲרוֹן עַל־עָפָר יָקוּם;—"And I know that my Redeemer liveth" or "is living;" "and afterwards he shall stand on the earth," or "rise on the dust." He believed that there was a גֹּאֵל, a Redeemer, promised, one that should free him from sin and misery. Aben Ezra, by "My Redeemer," understandeth a man that would assist him, or judge more favourably of his cause than his friends at that time did: שדבר בשבילא טובא. And his comment on חַי and אַחֲרוֹן is very fond: הוא היום בחיים או יהיה אחרון שיולד;—"He is at present living, or he shall be born hereafter." But is this גֹּאֵל חַי, a living Redeemer? חַי, *ὁ ζῶν*, "The living one," is a property of God: he is *Θεὸς ζῶν*, "The living God," 1 Tim. iv. 10; *ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν*, chap. vi. 16, "who alone hath immortality." A mortal man is not rightly called a living redeemer, one that hath life in his power. Besides, Job met with no such redeemer out of his troubles; and therefore R. Levi Ben Gershom confesseth that it is God who is intended: אשר הוא חי וקיים לנצח,—"Who is the living One, and liveth to eternity." Of this Redeemer Job saith, "He shall stand on the earth," or "rise on the dust." If the words be taken in the former sense (as they will bear either), his incarnation and coming into the world, if in the latter, his resurrection out of the dust, is intended. The former seems more probable, and the earth is expressed by עָפָר, "the dust," to denote the infinite condescension of this Redeemer, in coming to converse on this dust that we live in and upon. And this he shall do אַחֲרוֹן. The word is used to express the eternity of God: אֲנִי רִאשׁוֹן וַאֲנִי אַחֲרוֹן, Isa. xliv. 6; —"I am the first, and I am the last:" so chap. xlviii. 12. Whence Ralbag, [R. Levi Ben Gershom,] before mentioned, interprets this expression with respect to the works that God shall do in the earth in the latter days. And in this respect our Goël is said to be "Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the ending;" he that abides thus the same "after all" shall "stand on the earth." But the word also is often joined with דוֹר, a "generation," a time, a season,

Ps. xlviii. 14, cii. 19, and denotes the futurition of it, that it is to come, and shall come. So also with יוֹם, "a day," as Isa. xxx. 8, pointing out some signal latter day. And here it is used absolutely for בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, "in the latter days;" which is the ordinary description and designation of the days of the Messiah in the Old Testament. This is that which Job expected, which he believed. Though he was among the Gentiles, yet he believed the promise, and expected his own *personal redemption* by the blessed Seed. And thus, although God confined the posterity of Abraham after the flesh unto the land of Canaan, yet, because in the promised Seed he was to be "heir of the world," he gives unto the Messiah "the heathen to be his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession," Ps. ii. 8. And upon the accomplishment of the work assigned unto him, he promiseth that "all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him," Ps. xxii. 27,—a plain declaration of the Gentiles coming in for their share and interest in the redemption wrought by him. See Ps. xlv. 16. For these "rebellious ones" was he to "receive gifts," "that the LORD God might dwell among them," Ps. lxviii. 18; so that by him Egypt and Ethiopia were to stretch forth their hands unto God, verse 31; yea, "all kings were to fall down before him, and all nations to serve him," Ps. lxxii. 11–17.

31. These poor Gentiles were the "little sister" of the Judaical church, which was to be provided for in the love of her spouse, the Messiah, Cant. viii. 8, 9. For "in the last days," the days of the Messiah, "many people," yea, "all nations," are to be "brought unto the house of the LORD," and are to worship him acceptably, Isa. ii. 2–4. And expressly, chap. xi. 10, the "Root of Jesse," which the Jews grant to be the Messiah, is to "stand for an ensign unto the people," and "to it shall the Gentiles seek," even for that salvation and deliverance which he had wrought; and they are preferred therein before Israel and Judah, verse 12. "Egypt and Assyria," that is, the other nations of the world, are to be brought into the same covenant of the Messiah with Israel, chap. xix. 25: for "all flesh is to see the glory of God," and not the Jews only, chap. xl. 5; and the "isles," or utmost parts of the earth, are to "wait for the law" of the promised Messiah, chap. xlii. 4. And the whole of what we assert is summed up, chap. xlix. 6, where God speaks unto the promised Seed, and says, "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth;" where he is as fully promised unto the Gentiles, to be their "salvation," as ever he was unto Abraham or his posterity. See chap. li. 5, liii. 12. And on this account doth God call unto men in general to come

into his covenant, promising unto them an interest in the "mercies of David," and that because he hath given this Seed as a "witness" unto them, as a "leader and commander," or the "captain of their salvation," chap. lv. 1–4; the effect of which call, in the faith of the Gentiles, and their gathering unto the promised Seed, is expressed, verse 5. The like prophecies and predictions, of the Gentiles partaking in the redemption to be wrought, occur in all the prophets, especially Ezekiel, Micah, Zechariah, and Malachi; but the instances already produced are sufficient unto our purpose.

32. There seems yet to be somewhat inconsistent with what we have declared in the words of the apostle, Eph. iii. 3, 5, 6, "God by revelation made known unto me the mystery, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." The apostle seems to deny that this mystery, of the participation of the Gentiles in the blessing by the promised Seed, was revealed, or made known, before the time of its discovery in and by the gospel; and therefore could not be so declared by the prophets under the old testament as we have evinced. But indeed he doth not *absolutely* deny what is asserted; only he prefers the excellency of the revelation then made above all the discoveries that were before made of the same thing. The mystery of it was intimated in many prophecies and predictions, though, before their accomplishment, they were attended with great obscurity; which now is wholly taken away. "In former ages," οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη, "it was not," saith he, "fully, clearly, manifestly known," τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, לְבְנֵי אָדָם, "to the sons of men," in common and promiscuously, though it was intimated unto the prophets, and by them obscurely represented unto the church; but it was not made known ὡς νῦν, with that clearness, evidence, and perspicuity, as it is now by the apostles, and preached unto all. It is only, then, the *degrees* of the manifestation of this mystery, as to openness, plainness, and evidence, that are asserted by the apostle above all of the same kind which went before; but the *discovery* of it absolutely is not denied. And thus much was necessary in our passage, to secure our own interest in the mercy treated about.

33. We may now return a little again unto the promise given unto Abraham. In the pursuit hereof his posterity was separated to be a peculiar people unto God. Their church-state, the whole constitution of their worship, their temple and sacrifices, were all of them assigned and appointed unto the confirmation of the promise, and to the explanation of the way whereby the blessed Seed should be brought forth, and of the work that he should perform for the removal of sin and the curse, and the bringing in of everlasting right-

eousness, as shall elsewhere be manifested. Moreover, unto this Deliverer, and the deliverance to be wrought by him, with the nature of it and the means of its accomplishment, by what he was to do and suffer, do all the prophets bear witness. The full manifestation hereof, seeing it requires an explication of the *whole doctrine of the Messiah*, concerning his person, grace, and mediation, his offices, life, death, and intercession, the justification of sinners through his blood, and their sanctification by his Spirit, with all other articles of our Christian faith,—all which are taught and revealed, though obscurely, in the Old Testament,—would take up an *entire volume*, and be unsuitable unto our present design.

But three things in general the prophets give testimony unto him by:—First, By *preferring the promised relief and remedy above all the present glory* and worship of the church, directing it to look above all its enjoyments unto that which in all things was to have the pre-eminence. See Isa. ii. 2, iv. 2–6, vii. 13–15, ix. 6, 7, xi. 1–10, etc., xxxii. 1–4, xxxv. 1–10, xl. 1–5, 9–11, xlii. 1–4, xlix. 18, 19, li. 4–7, lix. 20, 21, lx., lxi. 1–3, etc., lxv. 17, 18; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, xxx. 9, xxxi. 31–34, xxxii. 40–42; Ezek. xl., etc.; Dan. vii. 27, ix. 24, xii. 1, 2; Hos. iii. 5; Joel iii. 18; Amos ix. 11–15; Obad. 21; Mic. iv. 1–4, v. 1–4; Hab. ii. 14; Hag. ii. 6–9; Zech. ii. 8–12, iii. 8–10, vi. 12, 13, ix. 9–11, xiv. 3, 4, 20; Mal. i. 11, iii. 1–3, iv. 2; —which places, although but a few of those that occur in the prophets, are yet too many to be particularly insisted on. But this they all teach, with one consent, that there was in the promise which they assert and confirm an excellency of blessings far exceeding in glory and worth, and in advantage unto believers, all that which they outwardly enjoyed, in their peace, prosperity, kingdom, and temple-worship. Now, this can be nothing but the spiritual and eternal deliverance of their persons from sin, curse, and misery, with the enjoyment of the favour of God in this life, and blessedness hereafter in his presence for evermore. And this, in particular, is expressed and declared in many of the promises directed unto, especially those which concern the making and establishing of the new covenant, which is that we are in the demonstration of.

Secondly, They do the same in the description they give of the *person* that was to be this remedy or relief, and of the *work* that he had to accomplish for that end and purpose. For the former, they declare that he was to be the "Son of God," God and man in one person, Ps. ii. 7, cx. 1; Isa. ix. 6, 7; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Zech. ii. 8–10; and in sundry other places is the same mystery intimated, whereby the church was further instructed how God would join with the nature of man in the *seed of the woman*, for the conquest of the old serpent and the destruction of his works. And for the latter, as they declare his sufferings in an especial manner, even what and

how he was to suffer, in the *bruising of his heel*, or bearing the effect of and punishment due to sin, Ps. xxii., Isa. liii., Dan. ix. 24, 25; so his teaching, ruling, and governing of his people, in their obedience unto God by him, until they are saved unto the uttermost, as the great prophet and king of his church, are by them fully manifested, Ps. ii., xxii. 28, xlv. 2–17, lxviii. 17, 18, lxxii. 2–17, lxxxix. 19–29, xcvi., xcvii., xcviii., xcix., cx.; Isa. ix. 6, 7, xi. 1–5, xxxii. 1, 2, xxxv., xl. 10, 11, xlii. 1–4, xlv. 22–25, xlix. 1–12, l. 4, lix. 16, 17, lxi. 1–3, lxiii. 1–6; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; Mic. iv. 2, 3, v. 1–4; Zech. ii. 8; Mal. iii. 1–4, as in sundry other places. Yea, herein all the prophets greatly abound, it being the principal work that God raised them up for, and inspired them by his Holy Spirit in their several generations, as Peter declares, 1 Epist. i. 10–12.

Thirdly, They did so also by taking off the *expectations* of men from looking after relief and deliverance by any other way or means whatsoever, Ps. xl. 6, 7. Add hereunto, that the whole fabric of the tabernacle and temple worship was contrived, appointed, and designed, in infinite wisdom, unto no other end but to instruct and direct the church unto this promised Deliverer and the salvation to be wrought by him; as shall, God assisting, abundantly be manifested in our Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

34. Thus do both the Law and the Prophets bear witness unto this promised Deliverer, and the deliverance to be wrought by him. And this is he whom the Jews and Christians call the Messiah. מָשִׁיחַ is from מָשַׁח, to "anoint" with oil. Those who were of old peculiarly consecrated unto God, in the great offices of kings, priests, and prophets, were, by his appointment, so to be anointed; at least some of them, on especial occasions, were so. Thence were they called מְשִׁיחִים, "Anointed ones." And because this anointing with oil was not appointed for its own sake, but for somewhat signified thereby, those who received the thing so signified, although not actually anointed with corporeal oil, are called anointed ones also, Ps. cv. 15. Now, this promised Seed, this Saviour or Deliverer, being appointed of God to perform his work in the discharge of a triple office, of king, priest, and prophet, unto his sacred people, and being furnished with those gifts and endowments which were signified by the anointing oil, is, by an antonomasia, called "The Messiah;" or מֶלֶךְ הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "Messiah the King," [Ps. ii. 2, 6?]; מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, "Messiah the Prince," Ruler, or Leader, Dan. ix. 25; and verse 26, מָשִׁיחַ, "Messiah" absolutely. The Greeks render this name Μεσσίας, which twice occurs in the New Testament, where persons of the Jewish faith and church are introduced expressing the Saviour they looked for, John i. 42, iv. 25. Otherwise the holy penmen constantly call the same person by another name, of the same signification in the language wherein they wrote with מָשִׁיחַ in the Hebrew,—Χριστός,

"The anointed one," "Christ." The Greek Μεσσίας and the Latin "Messiah" seem rather to be taken immediately from the Chaldee מְשִׁיחָא, "Meshicha," than from the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ, "Mashiach," and to come nearer unto it in sound and pronunciation. It is true, that the name is sometimes applied unto profane and wicked men, with respect unto the office or work whereunto they were of God designed; as to Saul, 1 Sam. xxiv. 6; and to Cyrus, Isa. xlv. 1; and the Jews call the priest who was to sound the trumpet when the people went forth to battle, Deut. xx. 8, משיח מלחמה, "The anointed unto the war." But, as was said, it is applied by the way of eminency unto the promised Seed, unto others by way of allusion and with respect unto their office and present work.

EXERCITATION IX.

PROMISES OF THE MESSIAH VINDICATED.

1. The first promise explained in the subsequent. 2. The name "Messiah" seldom used in the original, frequently in the Targums. 3. Places applied unto him therein, Gen. iii. 15—Use of their testimony against the present Jews. 4. Gen. xxxv. 21—Occasion of the mention of the Messiah in that place, from Mic. iv. 8. 5. Gen. xlix. 1, אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים first mentioned. 6. Ver. 10, "Until Shiloh come"—Agreement of the Targums. 7. Exod. xii. 42—Christ typified by the paschal lamb. 8. Exod. xl. 10, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, who—Dan. ix. 24. 9. Num. xi. 26—Tradition about the prophesying of Eldad and Medad. 10. Num. xxiii. 21, xxiv. 7, 17. 20, 24—Consent of Targums, Talmudists, Cabalists. 11–13. Deut. xviii. 15–19—The prophet promised, who. 14. 1 Sam. ii. 10—Hannah's prophecy of Christ. 15. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3—David's, in his last words, מוֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם. 16–18. 1 Kings iv. 33—Solomon's prophecy—Light of the church increased by David. 19. Ps. ii. vindicated. 20. Ps. xviii. 32. 21. Ps xxi. 1, 3, 7. 22. Ps. xlv. 23. Ps. lxviii., lxix. 24. Ps. lxxii.—Targum, Midrash, Commentators—Vulgar Latin corrupted, and the LXX.—פִּסָּה and יִנּוֹן, what. 25. Ps. lxxx. 16, 18, how to be rendered—בֶּן־אָדָם, who. 26. Ps. cx.—Prophecy of the Messiah—Confession of the Jews. 27. Of the Targum on Solomon's Song. 28. Isa. ii. 2–4. 29. Isa. iv. 2 vindicated. 30. 31. Isa. ix. 6—Sense of the Targum on the place—Vulgar Latin noted. 32. Entanglements of the Jews from this testimony. 33, 34. Four things promised, not agreeing to Hezekiah—Answer of Jarchi, Kimchi, Aben Ezra. 35. The name mentioned, whose—שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם, who 36. Answer of Abarbanel. 37. Of the increase of his government. 38. Isa. x. 27. 39. Isa. xi. 1, 6—Abarbanel's prediction of the ruin of the Christians. 40. Isa. xvi. 1. 41. Isa. xxviii. 5. 42. Isa. xlii. 1. 43. Isa. lii. 13. 44 Jer. xxiii. 5—Corruption of old translations—Purity of the original—Messiah, Jehovah our righteousness—Ezek. xxxvii. 24. 45. Jer. xxx. 21, xxxii. 13, 15. 46. Hos. iii. 5, xiv. 8. 47. Mic. iv. 8. 48. Mic. v. 2 vindicated—Kimchi's blasphemy. 49. Zech. iii. 8, iv. 7, vi. 12, x. 4, ix. 9, xi. 12, 13, xii. 10. 50. Conclusion.

1. Having considered the first great promise concerning the Messiah, and evinced from thence the nature of his work and office,

as also showed in general how testimony is given unto him throughout the Old Testament, and whence his *name* is derived, we shall now, moreover, inquire in particular into those places where he is expressly foretold, promised, or prophesied of; that we may thence gather what further light concerning his *person* and *natures*, with his employment, was granted unto the church of old, which the present Jews wilfully reject. And herein, as I am not to collect all the prophecies and promises which God gave concerning him by the mouth of his holy prophets from the foundation of the world, but only to single out some of the most eminent, that give us a direct description of his person or his grace, in answer unto or in confirmation of what hath been already discoursed about them; so I shall have an especial respect unto them which the Jews themselves do acknowledge to belong unto him. There is a book written by Abarbanel, which he calls משמרת ישועה, wherein he undertakes to explain all those texts of Scripture or prophecies which cannot be understood either *spiritually*, or of the *second temple*, but of their redemption by the *Messiah*. This at present, among others, I am forbidden the use of, which might have been of advantage in the present design. I shall therefore principally insist on those places which are applied unto him in the Targums, the most authentic writings amongst them; whereunto some others shall be added, which I have observed to be interpreted unto the same purpose in the best of their commentators.

2. The name "Messiah" is but twice or thrice at most used in the Old Testament directly and immediately to denote the promised Seed, namely, Dan. ix. 25, 26; whereunto Ps. ii. 2 may be added. But this name, on the reasons before given, prevailing in the Judaical church, it is frequently made use of and inserted in the Targums where he is treated of, although he be not expressly named in the original. Elias, in his Methurgamim, reckons up fifty of those places; whereunto one and twenty more are added by Buxtorf. The principal of these deserve our consideration, considering that some of the most eminent of them are denied by the *later Jews* to belong unto him, those especially which give testimony unto that part of the faith of Christians concerning him, his person and office, which by them is opposed or denied. And this consent of the Targums is of great weight against them, as containing an evidence of what persuasion prevailed amongst them before such time as they suited all their expositions of Scripture unto their own infidelity, in opposition to the gospel and doctrine thereof. And unto these, as was said, such others shall be added as their *chiefest masters* do yet acknowledge directly to intend him.

3. The first of this sort that occurs is the first promise, before insisted on and vindicated: Gen. iii. 15, "It," the Seed of the woman,

"shall bruise thy head,"—the head of the serpent. Mention is made here expressly of the Messiah in the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; and this promise is applied unto him after their manner. The Seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, and they shall obtain שפויתא בעקבא ביומי מלכא משיחא, "healing," or a plaster for the heel (the hurt received from the serpent), "in the days of Messiah the King." So Jonathan; and the Targum of Jerusalem useth words to the same purpose. Both of them expressly refer the promise to the days of the Messiah;—that is, to himself, or the work that he was to do; whence they insert his name into the text. And this is perfectly destructive unto the present pretensions of the Jews. The work here assigned unto him, of recovering from the evil of sin and misery, brought on the world through the temptation of the serpent, is that wherewith they would have him to have nothing to do. Besides, his *suffering* is intimated in the foregoing expression, that the serpent should "bruise his heel;" which they much desire to free their Messiah from. But that which principally lies against them in this testimony is, that whereas they appropriate the promise of the Messiah unto themselves, and make the doctrine concerning him to belong unto the law of Moses,—whereof, say some (those that follow Maimonides), it is one of the fundamentals, others (as Josephus Albo), that it is a branch of the fundamentals concerning rewards and punishments,—it is here given out, by the testimony of their Targums, unto the posterity of Adam indefinitely, two thousand years before the call and separation of Abraham, from whom they pretend to derive their privilege, and much longer before the giving of their law, whereof they would have it to be a part; which is diligently to be heeded against them.

4. Concerning the promises made unto Abraham we have spoken before. The next mention of the Messiah in the Targum is on Gen. xxxv. 21, where occasion is taken to bring him into the text: for unto these words, "And Israel journeyed and spread his tent לְמִגְדַּל־עֵדֶר," —"unto" (or "beyond") "the tower of Edar," Jonathan adds, אתרא דמתמן עתיד דאתגלי מלכא משיחא בסוף יומיא;—'Which is the place from whence the King Messiah shall be revealed in the end of the days." And this tradition is taken from Mic. iv. 8, וְאַתָּה מִגְדַּל־עֵדֶר;—"And thou, tower of Edar," (or "of the flock"), "unto thee shall it come, the first dominion." Now, this tower of Edar was a place in or near to Bethlehem, as is manifest from the place in Genesis; for whereas Jacob is said to stay at Ephrath, that is, Bethlehem, where he set up a pillar on the grave of Rachel, verses 19, 20, upon his next removal he spread his tent "beyond the tower of Edar," which must therefore needs be a place near unto Bethlehem. And the prophet assigning the rise of the kingdom of the Messiah unto that place, because he was to be born at Bethlehem, the paraphrast took occasion to

make mention of him here, where that place is *first spoken of*, declaring their expectation of his being born there; which accordingly was long before come to pass.

5. Gen. xlix. 1, "And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you what shall befall you בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים," "in the latter days," or "the last days," or "end of the days." Jonathan paraphraseth on these words: "After that" (or "although") "the glory of the divine Majesty was revealed unto him," קצא דעהיד מלכא משיחא למיתי אתכסי מיניה, "the time," that is, the express time, "wherein the King Messiah was to come was hid from him; and therefore he said, Come, and I will declare unto you what shall befall you in the end of the days." This expression of אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, "the end" or "last of the days," is a usual periphrasis for the days of the Messiah in the Old Testament. To that purpose it is used, Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30; Isa. ii. 2; Hos. iii. 5; Mic. iv. 1; and our apostle expressly refers unto it, Heb. i. 2. Now, whereas this expression denotes no certain season of time, but only *indefinitely* directs to the last days of the posterity of Jacob continuing a distinct church and people, for those ends for which they were originally separated from all others, and this being the first place wherein it is used, and which all the rest refer unto, the paraphrast here took occasion both to mention the Messiah, of whose time of coming this was to be the constant description, as also to intimate the reason of the frequent use of this expression; which was, because the *precise time* of his coming was hidden even from the best of the prophets, unto whom "the glory of the divine Majesty" was in other things revealed. Besides, the ensuing predictions in the chapter do sufficiently secure his application of the days mentioned unto the time of the Messiah.

6. Gen. xlix. 10, עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה;—"Until Shiloh come." All the three Targums agree in the application of these words unto the Messiah. Onkelos: עד דייתי משיחא;—"Until Messiah come." Jonathan and Jerusalem use the same words: עד זמן דייתי מלכא משיחא;—"Unto the time wherein the King Messiah shall come." An illustrious prophecy this is concerning him,—the first that limits the time of his coming with an express circumstance; and which must therefore afterwards be at large insisted on. At present it may suffice to remark the suffrage of these Targums against the perverseness of their later masters, who contend, by all artifices imaginable, to pervert this text unto other purposes; who are therefore to be pressed with the authority of the Targumists, which with none of their cavilling exceptions they can evade. The following words also, verses 11, 12, are applied by Jonathan unto the Messiah, in the pursuit of the former prediction, and that not unfitly, as hath been showed by others already. See Ainsworth on the place.

7. Exod. xii. 42, "It is a night to be much observed." Jerusalem Targ., "This is the fourth night" (it had mentioned three before), "when the end of this present world shall be accomplished to be dissolved, and the cords of impiety shall be wasted, and the iron yoke shall be broken;" that is, the people of God shall be delivered. Whereunto is added: משה יפוק מן גו מדברא ומלכא משיחא מן גו רומא; —"Moses shall come forth from the midst of the wilderness, and the King Messiah from the midst of Rome." That of the Messiah coming out of Rome is Talmudical, depending on a fable which we shall afterwards give an account of. And we may here, once for all, observe, that although they believe that their Messiah is to be a mere man, *born* after the manner of all other men, yet they never speak of his *birth* or nativity as a thing that they look for; only they speak of his *coming*, but most commonly of his being *revealed;* and their great expectation is, *when* he shall be discovered and revealed. And this proceedeth out of a secret self-conviction that he was born long since, even at the time promised and appointed, only that he is hidden from them; as indeed he is, though not in the sense by them imagined. But what makes for the application of the night of the passover to the coming of the Messiah? They cannot imagine that he shall come unto them whilst they are celebrating that ordinance; for that is not lawful for them unless they were at Jerusalem, whither they believe they shall never return until he come and go before them. It is, then, from some tradition amongst them, that their deliverance out of Egypt was a type of the deliverance by the Messiah, whose sacrifice and suffering were represented in the paschal lamb, which gave occasion unto this gloss.

8. Exod. xl. 10. Targum of Jonathan, "Thou shalt sanctify it for the crown of the kingdom of the house of Judah, ומלכא משיחא דעתיד למפרק ית ישראל בסוף יומיא,"—"and the King Messiah, who shall deliver Israel in the end of the days." The end of the unction there mentioned in the text is, that the things anointed might be קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "holiness of holinesses," unto the Lord. Now, it was the Messiah alone who truly and really was this "most holy One," Dan. ix. 24, לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "To anoint," or to make Messiah of, "the Holiness of holinesses," the most holy One; as he is called in the New Testament *ὁ ἅγιος*, "the Holy One," *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, Acts iii. 14, iv. 30; 1 John ii. 20; Rev. iii. 7. And hence, as it should seem, is this place applied unto him by the Targumist, and an intimation given that in all their holy things, their tabernacle, sanctuary, and altar, he was represented; for as he was the Most Holy, and his body the temple wherein "all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt," Col. ii 9, so *ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*, he "tabernacled amongst us," John i. 14, and is our "altar," Heb. xiii. 10.

9. Num. xi. 26, "But there remained two of the men in the camp,

the name of the one was Eldad, and the name of the other was Medad: and the Spirit rested upon them; and they were of them that were written, but went not out unto the tabernacle: and they prophesied in the camp." Here seemeth not to be any thing immediately relating unto the Messiah, yet two of the Targums have brought him into this place, but attended with such a story as I should not mention, were it not to give a signal instance in it how they raise their traditions. Eldad and Medad "prophesied in the camp," as the text assures us. What or whereabout they prophesied is not declared. This the Targumists pretend to acquaint us withal. Eldad, they say, prophesied of the death of Moses, the succession of Joshua, and their entrance into Canaan under his conduct. This caused one to run and inform Moses; which gave occasion to those words of his, verse 29, "Enviest thou for my sake?"—"For what if he do prophesy that I shall die?" and thereon he would not rebuke them. Medad prophesied of the coming of the quails to feed them. But *both of them* prophesied and said, בסוף יומיא גוג ומגוג והילותיה סלקין לירושלם ובידוי דמלכא משיחא אנון נפלין;—"In the latter days Gog and Magog shall ascend with their host against Jerusalem, and they shall fall by the hand of the Messiah;" whereon in Jonathan there followeth a story of the delicious fare and dainties which they fancy unto themselves in those days! But what is the reason that Eldad and Medad must be thought to prophesy thus concerning Gog? Ezek. xxxviii. 17, we have these words, "Thus saith the LORD God" (unto Gog); "Art thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days and years that I would bring thee against them?" Not finding any express prophecy in the Scripture, as they suppose, concerning Gog, because that name is not elsewhere used, they could not fasten these words anywhere better than on Eldad and Medad, concerning whom it is said that they prophesied, but nothing is recorded of what was spoken by them; whereon they think they may assign unto them what they please, although there is not the least reason to suppose that their prophesying consisted in predictions of things to come. Speaking of the things of God, and praising him in an extraordinary manner, is called "prophesying" in the Scripture. So these words of the children of the prophets, who came down from the high place with psalteries and harps, וְהֵמָּה מִתְנַבְּאִים, 1 Sam. x. 5, "And they are prophesying," is rendered in the Targum, ואיכון משבחין, "And they are praising," or singing praises unto God; which both their company and their instruments declare to have been their employment. But such occasions as these do they lay hold of for the raising of their figments, which in process of time grow to be traditions.

10. Num. xxiii. 21, xxiv. 7, 17, 20, 24. All the Targums agree that the Messiah is intended in these prophecies of Balaam, espe-

*

cially on these words, chap. xxiv. 17, "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre out of Israel." "A King," say they jointly, "shall arise out of Jacob, ויתרבא משיחא,"—"and the Messiah shall be anointed." And an illustrious prophecy it is, no doubt, concerning his coming and dominion, who is "the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning Star." Rashi interprets the place of David, who smote the corners of Moab, as he was in many things a type of Christ. Aben Ezra confesseth that many interpret the words concerning the Messiah; and Maimonides distributes the prophecy between David and the Messiah, assigning some things unto one, some to another: Tractat. de Regib. in בעל הטורים, also, they grant it to be a prophecy of the Messiah. And there is no doubt of the sense of their ancient masters, from the story of Bar-Cosba, whom, after they had accepted of for their Messiah, from this place they called Bar-Cochba, Akiba applying this prediction of כּוֹכָב, or the Star, unto him. And Fagius on the Targum in this place observes, that in the name כּוֹכָב, "Cochab," applied unto the Messiah, the Cabalists observe two things;—first, that the two first letters signify the same number with the letters of יְהוָה, the name of God, that is, 26; and the two latter 22, the number of the letters of the law. The observation is sufficiently Talmudical; but the intendment of it, that the Messiah hath in him the name of God, and shall fulfil the whole law, is a blessed truth. This Fagius, and Munster before him, observed out of צְרוֹר הַמֹּר, "A Bundle of Myrrh;" a kabalistical comment on the Pentateuch, by R. Abraham. But they all contend against the application of this prediction unto our Lord Jesus Christ; "For when," say they, "did he 'smite the corners of Moab?' when did he 'destroy all the children of Seth?' and how were these words, verse 18, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֹשֶׂה חָיִל," (which they interpret, "And Israel shall gather wealth," or "substance") "fulfilled?" But we have sufficiently proved the Messiah to be a spiritual Redeemer; and therefore, however his kingdom may be expressed in words signifying literally outward and temporal things, yet things spiritual and eternal are to be understood as figuratively set out by the other. Neither can these words be absolutely understood according to the letter; for whereas Seth was the son given unto Adam in the room of Abel, and all the posterity of Cain was cut off at the flood, if the Messiah literally "destroy all the children of Seth," he must not leave any one man alive in the world; which certainly is not the work he was promised for.

Besides, the Lord Christ hath partly already destroyed, and in due time will utterly destroy, all the stubborn enemies of his kingdom. Neither can the Jews press the instance of "Moab" literally, seeing themselves by "Edom" do constantly understand Rome, or the Roman empire.

11. Deut. xviii. 15-19. This place is an eminent prophecy concerning the Messiah, and of his prophetical office, not before anywhere mentioned. But the law being now given, which was to continue inviolably unto his coming, Mal. iv. 4, when it was to be changed, removed, and taken away, this part of his work, that he was to make the last, full, perfect declaration of the will of God, is now declared.

The Targums are here silent of him; for they principally attend unto those places which make mention of his kingdom. Rashi refers the words unto the series of prophets which were afterwards raised up; Aben Ezra, to Joshua; others, to Jeremiah, upon the rejection of whose warnings the people were carried into captivity, which they collect from verse 19. Whatever now they pretend, of old they looked for some one signal prophet from this place, which should immediately come before the Messiah himself. Thence was that question in their examination of John Baptist, "Art thou that prophet?" John i. 21,—namely, whom they looked for from this prediction of Moses. But it is the Messiah himself, and none other, that is intended; for,—First, None other ever arose like unto Moses. This is twice repeated;—in the words of Moses unto the people, verse 15, "God will raise thee up a prophet כָּמוֹנִי,"—"like unto me;" and in the words of God to Moses, verse 18, "I will raise them up a prophet, כָּמוֹךָ"—"like unto thee," "as thou art." Lipman, a blasphemous Jew, in his Nizzachon, contends that Jesus cannot be intended, because he was not like Moses: for Moses was a man only, Jesus declared himself to be God; Moses had father and mother, Jesus had not, as we say;—but the comparison intended doth not at all respect their persons or their natures, but their offices. It was in the *prophetical* office that the prophet foretold was to be like unto Moses: it is a *lawgiver*, one that should institute new ordinances of worship, by the authority of God, for the use and observance of the whole church, as Moses did; one that should reveal the whole will of God, as Moses did, as to that season wherein God employed him. That this could not be Joshua, nor any of the prophets that ensued, is evident from that testimony of the Holy Ghost, Deut. xxxiv 10, "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses." This must, therefore, be referred unto some *singular prophet* who was then to come, or there is an express contradiction in the text; and this is none other but the Messiah, concerning whom they acknowledge that he shall be a prophet above Moses. Secondly, The extermination threatened unto the people upon their disobedience unto this prophet here promised, chap. xviii. 19, never befell them until they had rejected the Lord Jesus, the true and only Messiah. Wherefore this place is rightly applied unto him in the New Testament, Acts iii. 22, 23, vii. 37. And we have hence a

further discovery of the nature of the Deliverer, and deliverance promised of old, and therein of the faith of the ancient church. He was to be a blessed prophet, to reveal the mind and will of God; which also he hath done unto the utmost. And from this place it is that the Jews themselves, in Midrash Coheleth, cap. i., say, גואל ראן כן גואל אחרון;—"The latter Redeemer is to be like the former."

12. Deut. xxv. 19, "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it," Jonathan Targum, ואפילו ליומי מלכא משיחא לא תתנשי;—"And also in the days of the Messiah, the King, thou shalt not forget it." But as this savours too much of those revengeful thoughts which they frequently discover themselves to be filled withal, so all these apprehensions proceed from the old tradition, that by the Messiah we should be delivered from the hands of "all our enemies;" which they, being carnal and earthly, do wrest to give countenance unto their own desires and imaginations.

13. Deut. xxx. 4, "If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the LORD thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee." Jonathan Targum, מתמן יכנוש יתכון מימרא דיי אלהכון על ידוי דאליהו כהנא רבא ומתמן יקרב יתכון על ידוי דמלכא משיחא;—"From thence will the Word of the Lord [your God] gather thee by the hand of Elijah, the great priest; and from thence will he bring thee by the hand of Messiah the King." The place is not amiss applied unto the deliverance which they shall one day have by the Messiah; for it is to happen after the whole curse of the law is come upon them for their disobedience, and after they shall turn again unto the Lord by repentance, verses 1, 2. And whereas the words are doubled, they suppose them to intimate a double work of deliverance; one whereof they have committed to Elias, from Mal. iv. 5, who was to be, and was, the forerunner of the Messiah.

And these are the places in the books of Moses wherein they acknowledge that mention is made of the Messiah. [As] for that way whereby the church of old was principally instructed in his work and office,—namely, in the *sacrifices* and *ceremonies* of the law,—they know nothing of it; nor shall it here be insisted on, seeing it must have so large a place in the Exposition of the Epistle itself.

14. 1 Sam. ii. 10, "He shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed." Targum, וירבי מלכות משיחיה;—"And he shall exalt the kingdom of his Messiah." In Midrash Tehillim also on Ps. lxxv., they ascribe this place unto the Messiah, and reckon his horn as the tenth horn of strength granted unto Israel. R. Levi Ben Gershom understands by the "king" in the first place, "He shall give strength unto his king," Saul; and by "Messiah," in the close of the words, David, who was to be anointed by Samuel,

the son of Hannah, whose words these are. Kimchi applies the words to the Messiah; whom, as he says, she intended by *the Spirit of prophecy*, or spoke of from *tradition*. And, indeed, the words seem directly to intend him; for by him alone doth the Lord judge the ends of the earth, and he was the Anointed whose power he would signally exalt. And I mention this place only as an instance of the faith of the church of old, which, in all her mercies, still had a regard unto the great promise of the Messiah, which was the fountain of them all; and therefore Hannah here closeth her prophetical eulogy with her acknowledgment thereof, and faith therein.

15. 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, מוֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם צַדִּיק מוֹשֵׁל יִרְאַת אֱלֹהִים;—"He that ruleth in man, just, ruler in" (or "of") "the fear of the LORD." Targum: אמר למנאה לי מלכא דהוא משיחא דעתיד דיקים וישלוט בדחלתא דיי; —"He said he would appoint unto me a King, which is the Messiah, who shall arise and rule in the fear of the Lord." And it refers this whole last prophecy of David, or his last words that he spake by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, unto the days of the Messiah; whence it gives this preface unto them, "These are the words of the prophecy of David, which he prophesied concerning the end of the world," or "for the end of the world," לסוף עלמא, "and the days of consolation that were to come." Rab. Isaiah and Rashi interpret the words of David himself; and Kimchi also, but he mentions the application of it unto the Messiah, who was to come of David, whom God would raise up unto him, which he approveth of. Christian expositors who follow the Jews interpret these words, לִי דִּבֶּר, "The Rock of Israel spake to me," by עלי, or דבר בעבורי, "spake concerning me;" that is, "by Samuel, who anointed me to be king:" some, "He spake unto me by Nathan."

Our translators keep to the letter, "He spake unto me;" and that alone answers unto the words of the verse foregoing, "The Spirit of the LORD דִּבֶּר־בִּי,"—"spake in me," or "to me:" so are the revelations of God expressed, see Zech. iv. 1, 4; and it expresseth the communication of the mind of God unto the prophet θεοπνευστία, and not his speaking by him unto others. And from these very words, רוּחַ יְהוָה דִּבֶּר־בִּי, "The Spirit of the LORD spake in me," do the Jews take occasion to cast the writings of David amongst those which they assign unto that kind of revelation which they call רוח הקדוש, or כתובים, "Books written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost." The other words also, וּמִלָּתוֹ עַל־לְשׁוֹנִי, "His word was in my tongue," manifest that it is David himself that is spoken *unto*, and not *of*, in the third verse; and therefore it is some other who is prophesied of by him, namely, the Messiah.

And this the words whereby he is described do also manifest: מוֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם,—"Ruling in man;" that is, saith Jarchi, בישראל שנקראו אדם שנאמר אדם אתם,—"Over Israel, who is called 'man;' as it is

said, 'And ye the flock of my pasture are men.'" אָדָם אַתֶּם,—"Ye are man," Ezek. xxxiv. 31. But where the word "Adam" is used with this prefix בְּ, as here, it nowhere signifies "Israel," but is expressly used in a contradistinction from them: as Jer. xxxii. 20, "Which hast set signs and wonders in the land of Egypt, even unto this day, וּבְיִשְׂרָאֵל וּבָאָדָם,"—"and in Israel, and in Adam;" that is, as we render it, "amongst other men" that are not Israel. So that if any especial sort of men are intended in this expression, it is not "Israel," but "other men." And indeed this word is commonly used to denote *mankind* in general, as Gen. vi. 3, ix. 6, Exod. viii. 17, ix. 10, xiii. 2; and universally, wherever it is used, it signifies either all mankind or human nature. So that מוֹשֵׁל בָּאָדָם is, he who is the "ruler over all mankind;" which is the Messiah alone: unless we shall interpret this expression by that of Ps. lxviii. 19, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם,"—"accepisti dona in homine," "and thou hast received gifts in man;" that is, in the human nature exalted, whereof the psalmist treats in that place. For whereas the apostle, Eph. iv. 8, renders these words, Ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, "He gave gifts unto men," it is manifest that he expresseth the *end and effect* of that which is spoken in the psalm; for the Lord Christ received gifts in his own human nature, that he might give and bestow them on others, as Peter declareth, Acts ii. 33. The remainder also of the words contain a description of the Messiah: he is צַדִּיק, ὁ δίκαιος, "the just" (or "righteous") "one," Acts iii. 14; and he alone is מוֹשֵׁל יִרְאַת אֱלֹהִים, "he that rules in the things that concern the fear and worship of God," Isa. xi. 2, 3. So that this place doth indeed belong unto the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah.

16. 1 Kings iv. 33, instead of these words concerning Solomon, "He spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall," the Targum reads, ואתנבי על מלכי בית דוד דעתידין למשלט בעלמא הדין ובעלמא דאתי דמשיחא,—"And he prophesied of the kings of the house of David in this world" (the duration of time and state of things under the old testament), "and of the Messiah in the world to come;" so they call the days of the Messiah. I know of none who have considered what occasion the Targumists could take from the words of the text to mention this matter in this place. I will not say that he doth not intend the Book of Canticles, wherein, under an allegory of trees, herbs, and spices, Solomon prophesieth of and sets forth the grace and love of Christ towards his church; and wherein many things are by the latter Targumist applied unto the Messiah also, as we shall see.

17. There is mention likewise made of the Messiah in the Targum by an addition unto the text, Ruth iii. 15, "It was said in the

prophecy that six righteous persons should come of Ruth, David, and Daniel with his companions, and the King Messiah."[1] The general end of the writing of this Book of Ruth, was to declare the providence of God about the genealogy of the Messiah; and this seems to have been kept in tradition amongst them. And for this cause doth Matthew expressly mention her name in his rehearsal of the genealogy of Christ, Matt. i. 5; for it being a tradition amongst the Jews that this was the end of the writing of her story,—whereon they add that consideration unto the text in their Targum,—it was remembered by the evangelist in a compliance therewithal.

18. The place of Job wherein he expresseth his faith in him, and expectation of redemption by him, hath been already explicated and vindicated, so that we shall not need here to insist upon it again. The Psalms next occur. In David the light and faith of the church began to be greatly enlarged. The renovation of the *promise* unto him, the confirmation of it by an *oath*, the confinement of the promised Seed unto his posterity, the establishment of his throne and kingdom as a type of the dominion and rule of the Messiah, with the especial revelations made unto him, as one that signally longed for his coming and rejoiced in the prospect which he had of it in the Spirit of prophecy, did greatly further the faith and knowledge of the whole church. Henceforward, therefore, the mention of him is multiplied, so that it would be impossible to insist on all the particular instances of it; I shall therefore only call over some of the most eminent, with an especial respect unto the concurrence of the persuasion and expectation of the Jews.

19. Ps. ii. 2, "The rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his Anointed,"—"his Messiah," as the word should be left uninterpreted. Targum, על משיחיה,—"Against his Messiah." The Talmudists in several places acknowledge this psalm to be a prophecy of the Messiah, and apply sundry passages thereof unto him. And these words, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee," are not amiss expounded by them, in Tract. Succah. cap. v., היום אגלה לבריות שאתה בני,—"I will this day reveal unto men that thou art my son;" for so are they applied by our apostle dealing with the Jews, Acts xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, namely, unto his resurrection from the dead, whereby he was "declared to be the son of God with power," Rom. i. 4. All the principal expositors amongst them, as Rashi, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, Bartenora, or Rab. Obodiah, acknowledge that their ancient doctors and masters expounded this psalm concerning the Messiah. Themselves, some of them, apply it unto David, and say it was composed by some of the singers concerning him when

[1] This quotation is not very correctly given. As it stands in the Targum it is to the following effect: ומן יד אתאמר בנבואה דעתידין למיפק מנה שיתא צדיקי עלמא דוד ודניאל וחבריהי ומלכא משיחא;—"And immediately it was said by prophecy, that hereafter there should proceed from her the six righteous ones of the world, David, and Daniel and his companions, and King Messiah."—ED.

he was anointed king, which the Philistines hearing of, prepared to war against him, 2 Sam. v. 17. This is the conceit of Rashi, who herein is followed by sundry Christian expositors, with no advantage to the faith; and I presume they observed not the reason he gives for his exposition. "Our masters," saith he, "of blessed memory, interpret this psalm of the King Messiah, ולפי משמעו ולתשובת המינין נכון לפרישו על דוד,"—"but as the words sound, and to answer the heretics, it is meet (or right) to expound it of David." These words, ולתשובת המינין, "and that we may answer the heretics," or Christians, are left out in the Venice and Basil editions of his comments, but were in the old copies of them. And this is the plain reason why they would apply this psalm to David, of whom not one verse of it can be truly and rightly expounded, as shall be manifested elsewhere. And it is a wise answer which they give in Midrash Tehillim unto that testimony of verse 7, where God calls the Messiah his son, to prove him to be the natural son of God: מבאן תשובה למינין שהן אומרין יש בן להב״ה ואתה מותיב ליה בן לי אתה אינו אומר אלא בני אתה;—"And hence we may have an answer for the heretics, who say that the holy, blessed God hath a son. But do thou answer, He says not, 'Thou art a son to me,' but, 'Thou art my son'"! As though אתה בני, "Thou art my son," did not more directly express the filiation of the person spoken of than בן לי אתה would do. בני is more emphatically expressive of the natural relation than בן לי,—"My son," than "A son to me." See Gen. xxvii. 21. And in this psalm we have a good part of the creed of the ancient church concerning the Messiah, as may be learned from the exposition of it.

20. Ps. xviii. 32. Targum, [ארום על נסא ופורקנא דתעביד למשיחך];—"Because of the miracles and redemption which thou shalt work for thy Messiah." I mention this place only that it may appear that the Jews had a tradition amongst them that David in this psalm bare the person of the Messiah, and was considered as his type. And hence our apostle applies these words, verse 3, אֶחֱסֶה־בּוֹ, "I will put my trust in him," unto the Lord Jesus Christ, Heb. ii. 13. See also Ps. xx. 7.

21. Ps. xxi. 1, "The king shall joy in thy strength, O LORD." Targum, מלך משיחא,—"The King Messiah shall rejoice." Verse 7, "For the king trusteth in the LORD." Targum, "Messiah the King." And in Midrash Tehillim these words of verse 3, "Thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head," are also applied unto him. There is no mention of him in the Targum on Psalm xxii., nor in the Midrash; but we shall afterwards prove at large that whole psalm to belong unto him, and to have been so acknowledged by some of their ancient masters, against the oppositions and cavils of their later seducers.

22. Ps. xlv. The Targum hath given an especial title unto this psalm: לשבחא על יתבי סנהדרין דמשה;—"A psalm of praise for the elders" (assessors) "of the sanhedrim of Moses;" intimating that something eminent is contained in it. And these words, verse 2,

"Thou art fairer than the children of men," are rendered in it, שופרך מלכא משיחא עדיף מבני נשא,—"Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is more excellent than that of the sons of men." And "grace," in the next words, is interpreted by רוח נבואה, "the Spirit of prophecy," not amiss. And these words, verse 6, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," are retained with little alteration: בורסי יקרך יי קים לעלמי עלמין,—"The seat of thy glory, O God, remaineth for ever and ever," applying it unto the Messiah; which illustrious testimony given unto his deity shall be vindicated in our exposition of the words, as cited by our apostle, Heb. i. 8. Kimchi expounds this psalm of the Messiah. Aben Ezra says, "It is spoken of David, או על משיח בנו שכן שמו דוד עבדי נשיא להם לעולם,"—"or concerning Messiah his son, who is likewise called David; as, 'My servant David shall be their prince for ever,'" Ezek. xxxvii. 25.

23. Ps. lxviii. and lxix. are illustrious prophecies of the Messiah, though the Jews take little notice of them; and that because they treat of two things which they will not acknowledge concerning him. The former expresseth him to be *God*, verses 17, 18; and the other his *sufferings* from God and men, verse 26; both which they deny and oppose. But in Shemoth Rabba, sect. 35, they say of the חַשְׁמַנִּים, Ps. lxviii. 32, "The princes that shall come out of Egypt," כל האומות עתידין להביא דורון למלך המשיח,—"All nations shall bring gifts to the King Messiah," referring the psalm to his days and work. The same exposition is given of the place in Midrash, Esther i. 1, and by R. Obodiah Haggaon on the place.

24. Ps. lxxii. 1, "Give the king thy judgments, O God." Targum, הלכת דינך למלכא משיחא הב,—"Give the sentence of thy judgment unto the King Messiah." And herein they generally agree. Midrash on the title: זה מלך המשיח שנאמר ויצא חוטר מגזע ישי;—"This is the King Messiah; as it is said, 'A rod shall come forth from the stem of Jesse,'" Isa. xi. 1. And Aben Ezra on the same title: נבואת דוד אי אחד המשוררים על שלמה או על משיח;—"A prophecy of David, or of one of the singers, concerning Solomon, or concerning the Messiah." And Kimchi acknowledgeth that this psalm is expounded by many of them concerning the Messiah. Rashi applies it unto Solomon, as a prayer of David for him, whereof he gives this as the occasion: שצפה ברוח הקודש שהוא עתיד לשאול מאת הב"ה לב להבין לשמור משפט;—"He prayed this prayer for his son Solomon, because he saw by the Holy Ghost that he would ask of God a heart to understand and keep" (or "do") "judgment." And although he endeavours vainly to apply verse 5 unto his days, "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure;" and verse 7, "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace, עַד־בְּלִי יָרֵחַ," —"till there be no moon;" yet when he cometh unto these words, verse 16, יְהִי פְּסַת־בַּר בָּאָרֶץ, "There shall be an handful of corn, in the earth," he adds, "Our masters interpret this of the cates, or

dainties, in the days of the Messiah, and expound the whole psalm concerning Messiah the King." And this he was enforced unto, lest he should appear too openly to contradict the Talmudists, who frequently apply this psalm unto him, and have long discourses about some passages in it, especially this, פִּסַּת־בַּר, verse 16, and לִפְנֵי־שֶׁמֶשׁ יִנּוֹן שְׁמוֹ, verse 17, which are much insisted on by Martinus Raymundus, Petrus Galatinus, and others.

The Vulgar Latin, for פִּסַּת־בַּר, reads, "Erit firmamentum in terra;" which I should suppose to be corrupted from "frumentum," but that the LXX., who are followed also by other translations, as the Arabic and Ethiopic, read στήριγμα, "firmamentum." And this some think to be corrupted from σίτου δράγμα, "an handful of corn;" which is very probable. Neither is the word פִּסַּת anywhere else used in the Scripture, and may as well have something foreign in it as come from פסים יפס. So also verse 17, יִנּוֹן is nowhere else used for "sobolescet" or "filiabit," as it is here rendered, from נִין, "a son:" which is but thrice used in that signification;—Gen. xxi. 23, by a Philistine; and Job xviii. 19, by an Arabian; and Isa. xiv. 22, concerning a son among the Chaldeans: which argue it to be a foreign word, being properly used in a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, as this is. So in the same subject it is said חַשְׁמַנִּים, "Chasmannim shall come to the Messiah," Ps. lxviii. 32: which we render "princes," and it may be such were intended; but the word seems to be Egyptian, for Hebrew it is not, though afterwards used among the Jews; whence the family of Mattathias were called Asmoneans. But to return: it is evident that in this psalm much light was communicated unto the church of old into the office, work, grace, compassion, and rule, of the Messiah, with the calling and glorious access of the Gentiles unto him.

25. There is mention likewise made of him in the Targum on Ps. lxxx. 16, "The vineyard which thy right hand hath planted, וְעַל־בֵּן אִמַּצְתָּה לָּךְ,"—"and on the branch thou hast made strong for thyself:" so our translation. But all old translations, as the LXX., Vulgar Latin, and Syriac, interpret בֵּן not in analogy unto the preceding allegory of the vine, but from בֶּן־אָדָם, verse 18, and render it, Ἐπὶ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου,—"Super filium hominis,"—"And upon the Son of man, whom thou madest strong for thyself." Targum, ועל מלכא משיחא דחילתא לך,—"And for the King Messiah, whom thou hast strengthened" (or "fortified") "for thyself." And we know how signally in the gospel he calls himself "The Son of man;" and among other names ascribed unto him, the Talmudists say he is called "Jinnon," from נן, "a son." And verse 18 he is expressly called בֶּן־אָדָם, "The Son of man, whom thou madest strong for thyself." And hereunto doth Aben Ezra refer the בֵּן in the foregoing verse. And for that expression, תְּהִי־יָדְךָ עַל־אִישׁ יְמִינֶךָ, "Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand," he observes, כל יד ואחריו בית לגנאי,—"Whenever Jad, the hand,"—

that is, the hand of God,—"hath Beth following it, it is for reproach or punishment unto them whom it respects;" as Exod. ix. 3, הִנֵּה יַד־יְהוָה הוֹיָה בְּמִקְנְךָ,—"Behold, the hand of the LORD is upon thy cattle," that is, for their destruction. And, ואם איננה בב״ית היא לשבח, —"If Beth follow not, it is for praise, or help;" as Ps. cxix. 173, תְּהִי יָדְךָ לְעָזְרֵנִי,—"Let thine hand help me," or "be for my help." So that the words are a prayer for the Son of man; and as our Lord Christ was the Son of man, so he was the true vine, whereof the Father is the husbandman, and his disciples the branches, John xv. 1–5. And he himself also was "called out of Egypt," Matt. ii. 15, as was the vine spoken of in this psalm; so that he who is afflicted in all the afflictions of his people is principally intended in this prophetical psalm. Aben Ezra would have the "Son of man" to be Israel; but not seeing well how it can be accommodated unto them, he adds, "The words may respect Messiah Ben Ephraim,"—an idol of their own setting up. But the Targum acknowledgeth the true Messiah here, for whose sake the church is blessed, and by whom it is delivered.

26. Ps. cx. is a signal prophecy of him, describing his person, kingdom, priesthood, and the work of redemption wrought by him. But whereas sundry things in this psalm are interpreted and applied unto the Lord Christ by our apostle in his Epistle unto the Hebrews, where they fall directly under our consideration, I shall here only briefly reflect on some of their own confessions, although it be a signal declaration of the faith of the church of old, scarcely to be paralleled in any other place. The later masters, indeed, observing how directly and openly this psalm is applied unto the Lord Christ in the New Testament, and how plainly all the passages of it are accommodated unto the faith of Christians concerning the Messiah, his office and work, do endeavour their utmost to wrest it unto any other, as shall elsewhere be manifested; yea, the Targum itself is here silent of the Messiah, for the very same reason, and perverts the whole psalm to apply it unto David; and yet is forced on verse 4 to refer the things spoken of unto the "world to come," or days of the Messiah. And the most of their masters, when they mention this psalm occasionally, and mind not the controversy they have about it with Christians, do apply it unto him. So doth the Midrash Tehillim on Ps. ii. 7, and also on this psalm, verse 1, though there be an endeavour therein foolishly to wrest it unto Abraham; Rab. Saadias Gaon on Dan. vii. 13, whose words are reported by Solomon Jarchi on Gen. xxxv. 8; Rab. Arama on Gen. xv., as he is at large cited by Munster on this psalm; Moses Haddarshan on Gen. xviii. 1; Rab. Obodiah on the place; all whose words it would be tedious here to report. It is sufficiently manifest that they have an open conviction that this psalm contains a prophecy concerning the Messiah; and what excellent things are revealed therein touching

his person and offices, we shall have occasion to declare in the exposition of the Epistle itself, wherein the most material passages of it are applied unto our Lord Jesus Christ.

27. In the Targum on the Canticles there is frequent mention also of the Messiah; as chap. i. 8, iv. 5, vii. 14, viii. 1–4. But because the Jews are utterly ignorant of the true spiritual sense of that divine song, and the Targum of it is a confused miscellany of things sufficiently heterogeneous, being a much later endeavour than the most of those on the other books, I shall not particularly insist on the places cited, but content myself with directing the reader unto them. The like also may be said of Eccles. i. 11, vii. 25; where, without any occasion from the text, the mention of him is importunely inculcated by the Targumists.

28. We are now entering on the Prophets, the principal work of some whereof was to "testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that was to follow," 1 Pet. i. 11; and therefore I do not at all design to gather up in our passage all that is foretold, promised, declared, and taught, concerning him in them (a work right worthy of more peace, leisure, and ability, than what in any kind I am intrusted withal), but only to report some of the most eminent places, concerning which we have the common suffrage of the Jews, in their general application unto the Messiah. Among these, that of Isa. ii. 2–4 occurreth in the first place: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares," etc.

The same prophecy is given out by Micah, in the same words, chap. iv. 1–3; and, by the common consent of the Jews, the Messiah is here intended, although he be not mentioned in the Targum. The Talmudical fable, also, of the lifting up of Jerusalem three leagues high, and the setting of Mount Moriah on the top of Sinai, Carmel, and Tabor, which shall be brought together unto that purpose, mentioned in Midrash Tehillim, and in Bava Bathra, Distinc. Hammocher, is wrested from these words. But those also of them who pretend to more sobriety do generally apply them to the promised Messiah. Kimchi gives it for a rule, that that expression, בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, "In the latter days," doth still denote the times of the Messiah; which, I suppose, is not liable unto any exception. And as he giveth a tolerable exposition of the establishing of "the mountain of the

LORD in the top of the mountains," assigning it to the glory of the worship of God above all the false and idolatrous worship of the Gentiles, which they observed on mountains and high places; so concerning these words, [Isa. ii.] 4, וְשָׁפַט בֵּין הַגּוֹיִם,—"He shall judge among the nations," he saith, השופט הוא מלך המשיח,—"This judge" (or "He that judgeth") "is the King Messiah." The like also saith Aben Ezra on the same place, and Jarchi on the same words in the prophecy of Micah. And as this is true, so whereas Jehovah alone is mentioned in the foregoing verses, unto whom, and no other, this expression can relate, how is it possible for them to deny that the Messiah is "the LORD, the God of Jacob" also? for undeniably it is he concerning whom it is said that "he shall judge among the nations;" and by their confession that it is the Messiah who is the "shophet," the judge here intended, they are plainly convinced out of their own mouths, and their infidelity condemned by themselves.

Abarbanel seems to have been aware of this entanglement, and therefore, as he wrests the prophecy (by his own confession contrary to the sense of all other expositors) unto the times of the building of the second temple, so, because he could not avoid the conviction of *one* that should judge among the nations, he makes it to be the *house itself*, wherein, as he says, "thrones for judgment were to be erected;" the vanity of which figment secures it from any further confutation.

We have, then, evidently in these words three articles of the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah: as,—First, That as to his *person*, he should be God and man, the "God of Jacob," who should in a bodily presence judge the people, and send forth the law among the nations, verse 4. Secondly, That the *Gentiles* should be called unto faith in him and the obedience of his law, verse 3. Thirdly, That the *worship* of the Lord in the days of the Messiah should be far more glorious than at any time whilst the first temple was standing; for so it is foretold, verse 2, and so our apostle proves it to be in his Epistle to the Hebrews. And this whole prophecy is not a little perverted by them who apply it to the defeat of Rezin and Pekah when they came against Jerusalem, and who, in their annotations on the Scripture, whereby they have won to themselves a great reputation in the world, seldom depart from the sense of the Jews, unless it be where they are in the right.

29. Isa. iv. 2, "In that day shall the Branch of the LORD be beauty and glory." Targ., בעדנא ההיא יהי משיחא דיהוה לחדוה וליקר;—"At that time shall the Messiah of the Lord be for joy and honour." And this prophecy also is, by the most learned of the rabbins, applied unto the Messiah. Kimchi interprets צֶמַח, "The Branch," by that of Jer. xxiii. 5, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper." Aben Ezra inclines unto them who would have Hezekiah to be intended. A Christian expositor refers

the words to Ezra and Nehemiah upon the return from the captivity, on what grounds he doth not declare. Abarbanel having, as is his manner always, repeated the various expositions and opinions of others, adds at last, ואחרים פירשו אותם על משיח צדקנו במהרה יגלה;—"Others expound the words of the Messiah our righteousness: Let him be speedily revealed!" But they may also do well to consider, that the person here promised to be the beauty and glory of the church, by whom the remnant of Israel, which are "written in the book of life," shall be saved, is the "*Branch of the* LORD" and the "*fruit of the earth:*" which better expresseth his two natures in one person than that he should be for a while a barren branch, and afterwards bear fruit in the destruction of Gog and Magog; which is their gloss on the words.

The illustrious prophecies concerning the name of the Messiah, Immanuel, and his being born of a virgin, chap. vii. viii., must be handled apart afterwards and vindicated from the exceptions of the Jews, and are therefore here omitted.

30. Isa. ix. 6, "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Targ., ואתקרי שמיה כן קדם מפליא עצה אלהא;—"And his name is called of old." כן קדם is the same with מִקֶּדֶם, Micah v. 1. Targ., מלקדמין; that is, as in the next words, "from everlasting," "from the days of eternity:" for although מן קדם be frequently used for מלפני, "from before the face," or "sight," as the words of the Targumist are here vulgarly translated, (as in the translation in the Polyglott Bibles, "A facie admirabilis consilii Deus,"—which is blamed by Cartwright in his Mellificium for not putting "Deus" in the genitive case as well as "admirabilis," which indeed were rational if מן קדם were necessarily "a facie,")—yet it is also used absolutely with reference unto time, and so there is no need that the following words should be regulated thereby. So is it twice used: as Prov. viii. 22, ומן קדם עובדוי,—"And before his works" that were wrought, that is, from eternity; and verse 23, ומן קדם עלמא,—"And before the world." And in that sense is מלקדמין always used; as Isa. xxiii. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 2; Isa. xlvi. 10. And thus the words will yield a better sense than "A facie admirabilis consilii Deus," or that which they are cast into by Seb. Munster, "Mirificantis consilium Deo fortissimo qui manet in secula;" for there is no need, as we have seen, that the words should be cast into the genitive case by מן קדם. And although the Targumist rendereth יוֹעֵץ, the participle, "counsellor," by the substantive עצה, "counsel," yet this hinders not but that it may express one of his names: "Wonderful, Counsel, God;" or, "Mirificans consilium Deus;" or, "The God of wonderful counsel." One, from some of the Jews, takes another way to pervert these words. "Consiliarius, Deus fortis, imo," saith he, "Consultator Dei fortis,

i.e., Qui in omnibus negotiis consilia a Deo poscet, per prophetas scilicet:" whereby this clear and honourable testimony given unto the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ is weakened and impaired.

Again, the Targumist renders וְיִקְרָא, "be called," by ואתקרי, in a passive sense; which obviates the principal exception of the modern Jews, who interpret it actively, that it may be referred to God, the wonderful Counsellor, who shall call him "The Prince of Peace." But as this is contrary to the Targum, so also to the use of the word in like cases: for this declaration of the name of the child promised answers the proclamation made of the name of God, Exod. xxxiv. 6, where וַיִּקְרָא is well rendered by ours, "and proclaimed," or, "and there was proclaimed;" the name following sounded in his ears: where the Vulgar Latin, translating the word actively, and applying it unto Moses, ("Stetit Moses cum eo invocans nomen Domini, quo transeunte coram eo ait, Dominator Domine Deus,"—"Moses stood with him, calling on the name of the Lord, who passing by, he said, O mighty Ruler, Lord God,") both corrupts the proper sense of the words and gives us that which is directly untrue; for not Moses, but God himself, gave out and proclaimed that name, as it is said expressly that he would do, chap. xxxiii. 19, and as Moses himself afterwards pleaded that he had done, Num. xiv. 17, 18. But this by the way, to obviate the Judaical sophism mentioned, that would make all the names in the text, unless it be "The Prince of Peace," to precede the verb, and that to be actively understood.

31. It follows in the Targum, גברא קים לעלמיא משיחא דשלמא יסגי עלנא ביומוהי. The words are variously rendered. Some refer גברא to אלהא that goes before; so expressing them by "Deus fortis," or "fortissimus,"—"The mighty God." Others, as the translation in the Biblia Regia and Londini, refer to the words following, קים לעלמיא, and render it by "vir," "the man:" "Vir permanens in æternum;"—"The man abiding for ever." But it doth not seem that this sense will hold; for although גברא do signify "a man," the same with the Hebrew גֶּבֶר, yet גברא is not so used, but only for "fortis" or "fortissimus." גִּבּוֹר, the word used in the original, is applied to God and men, but here it seems to be joined with אֵל, and to signify, as by us translated, "The mighty God," which the Targumist endeavoured also to express; and so by קים לעלמיא, "permanens in secula," "abiding for ever," he rendereth אֲבִי־עַד, "The Father of eternity," significantly enough. Also, משיחא is joined by some with דשלמא, and rendered "Messia Pacis," for שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם, "The Prince of Peace;" but this connection of the words those that follow will not well bear, wherefore they place the name Messiah absolutely, and render the following words, "Whose peace shall be multiplied unto us in his days."

32. And this testimony of their Targum the present Jews are

much to be pressed withal; and there are not many from which they feel their entanglements more urgent upon them. And it would at the same time move compassion at their blindness, and indignation against their obstinacy, for any one seriously to consider how wofully they wrest the words up and down to make a tolerable application of them unto Hezekiah, whom they would fix this prophecy upon; and, on the occasion given us by the Targum, I shall take a little view of their sentiments on this place of the prophet. That of old they esteemed it a prophecy of the Messiah, not only the Targum, as we have seen, but the Talmud also, doth acknowledge. Besides, also, they manifest the same conviction in their futilous traditions. In Tractat. Sanhed. Distinc. Chelek, they have a tradition that God thought to have made Hezekiah to be the Messiah, and Sennacherib to have been Gog and Magog; but מדת הדין, "the property of judgment," interposed, and asked why David rather was not made the Messiah, who had made so many songs to the praise of God. And Rabbi Hillel, as we shall see afterwards, contended that Israel was not any more to look for a Messiah, seeing they enjoyed him in Hezekiah. Now, these vain traditions arose merely from the concessions of their old masters, granting the Messiah to be here spoken of, and the craft of their later ones, wresting the words unto Hezekiah; so casting them into confusion, that they knew not what to say nor believe. But let us see how they acquit themselves at last in this matter.

33. Four things are here promised concerning this "child," or "son," that should be given unto the church:—(1.) That "the *government* should be on his shoulder;" (2.) That "his *name* should be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace;" (3.) That "of the *increase* of his government there should be no end;" (4.) That he should *sit* "*on the throne of David*, to order it for ever." And we may see how well they accommodate these things unto Hezekiah, their endeavours being evidently against the faith of the ancient church, the traditions of their fathers, and, it may be doubted, their own light and conviction.

First, "The *government* shall be on his shoulder," saith Sol. Jarchi, "because the rule and yoke of God shall be upon him in the study of the law." This pleaseth not Kimchi (as it is indeed ridiculous), and therefore he observeth that mention is not made of the shoulder but with reference unto burden and weight; whence he gives this interpretation of the words: לפי שאחז היה עובד למלך אשור והי' סובלי על שכמו אמ' כי זה הילד לא תהי עבוד על שכמו אלא משרה;—"Because Ahaz served the king of Assyria, and his burden was on his shoulder, he says of this child, he shall not be a servant with his shoulder, but the government shall be on him." And this, it seems, is all that is here promised, and this is all the concernment of the

church in this promise: Hezekiah shall not serve the king of Assyria! Neither is it true that Ahaz served the king of Assyria under tribute; and it may seem rather that Hezekiah did so for a season, seeing it is expressly said that "he rebelled against him, and served him not," 2 Kings xviii. 7; yea, plainly he did so, and paid him, by way of tribute, "three hundred talents of silver, and thirty talents of gold," verse 14. So he. Aben Ezra passeth over this expression without taking notice of it.

34. Secondly, As to the *name* ascribed unto him, they are for the most part agreed; and unless that one evasion which they have fixed on will relieve them, they are utterly silent. Now this is, as was before declared, that the words are to be read, "The Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, shall call his name The Prince of Peace;" so that "The Prince of Peace" only is the name of the promised child, all the rest are the names of God. But, —(1.) If words may be so transposed and shuffled together as these are to produce this sense, there will nothing be left certain in the Scripture; nor can they give any one instance of such a disposal of words as they fancy in this place. (2.) The very reading of the words rejects this gloss, "He shall call his name Wonderful." (3.) It is the name of the child, and not of God that gives him, which is expressed for the comfort of the church. (4.) What tolerable reason can be given for such an accumulation of names unto God in this place? (5.) There is nothing in the least, not any distinctive accent, to separate between "The Prince of Peace" and the expressions foregoing, but the same person is intended by them all; so that it was not Hezekiah, but the mighty God himself, who in the person of the Son was to be incarnate, that is here spoken of.

35. Besides, on what account should Hezekiah so eminently be called "The Prince of Peace,"—שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם? *Prince* is never used in the Scripture with reference unto any thing, but he that is so called hath chief power and authority over that whereof he is the שַׂר, "prince," chief, or captain; as שַׂר־צָבָא is the "general," or chief commander of the army, under whose command and at whose disposal it is. By the Greeks it is rendered ἄρχων and ἀρχηγός: as the apostle calls our Lord Jesus Christ Ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, Acts iii. 15, "The Prince of Life;" and Ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας, Heb. ii. 10, "The Prince" (or "Captain") "of Salvation." Nor is the word once in the Old Testament applied unto any one but him that had power and authority over that of which he was the שַׂר or "prince," to give, grant, or dispose of it as he thought meet. And in what sense, then, can Hezekiah be called "The Prince of Peace?" Had he the power of peace of any sort in his hand? was he the lord of it? was it at his disposal? The most of his reign he spent in war, first with his neighbours the Philistines, 2 Kings xviii. 8, and afterwards with the king of Assyria,

who took all the cities of Judah, one or two only excepted, verse 13. And in what sense shall he be called "The Prince of Peace?" The rabbins, after their wonted manner to fetch any thing out of a word, whether it be aught to their purpose or no, answer, that it was because of that saying, Isa. xxxix. 8, "For there shall be peace and truth in my days." But this being spoken with respect unto the very latter part of his reign, and that only with reference unto the Babylonian captivity, which was afterwards to ensue, is a sorry foundation to entitle him unto this illustrious name, "The Captain, Prince, or Lord of Peace;" which bespeaks one that had all peace (and that in the Scripture language is all that is good or prosperous, both temporal and spiritual, in reference unto God and man) in his power and disposal. And yet this is the utmost that any of them pretend to give countenance unto this appellation.

36. Abarbanel, who heaps together the interpretations, conjectures, and traditions, of most that went before him, seems to agree with Kimchi in that of "the government being upon his shoulder," because his father Ahaz sent מִנְחָה, "a present" unto the king of Assyria, but he did not; whereas it is expressly said that he paid him tribute of "three hundred talents of silver, and thirty talents of gold;" for the raising whereof he emptied his own treasures, and the treasures of the house of God, yea, and cut off the gold from the doors and pillars of the temple, 2 Kings xviii. 14–16: yet he mentions that other fancy of Rashi about the study of the law, and so leaves it. But in this of the name ascribed unto him he would take another course: for finding Hezekiah, in their Talmud. Tract. Sanhed. Perek Chelek, called by his masters, בעל שמנה שמות, "He who had eight names,"—as Sennacherib is also childishly there said to have had,—he would in the first place ascribe all these names unto Hezekiah, giving withal such reasons of them as I dare not be so importune on the reader's patience as to transcribe; and himself, after he had ascribed this opinion to Jonathan the Targumist and Rashi, embraceth the other of Kimchi, before confuted, and yet knows not how to abide by that either.

37. Thirdly, How can it be said of Hezekiah, that "of the increase of his government there should be no end," seeing he lived but four and fifty years, and reigned but twenty-nine, and his own son Manasseh, who succeeded him, was carried captive into Babylon? But as unto this question, and that which follows, about his "sitting upon the throne of David for ever," after they have puzzled themselves with the great mystery of "Mem clausum" in לְמַרְבֵּה, they would have us to suppose that these words concerned only the life of Hezekiah, though it be not possible that any other word should be used more significantly expressing perpetuity.

"Of the increase of his government" אֵין קֵץ, "no end,"—it shall

be endless; and he shall rule מעתה ועד־עולם, "from hence," or "now, and unto for ever," for evermore.

And thus, by the vindication of this place from the rabbinical exceptions, we have not only obtained our principal intention about the promise of a Deliverer, but also showed who and what manner of person he was to be,—even a child that was to be born, who should also be the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, whose rule and dominion was to endure for ever.

38. Isa. x. 27, "The yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing." Targum: ויתברון עממיא מן קדם משיחא;—"And the people shall be broken before the Messiah." And, it may be, some respect may be had in these words unto the promised Seed, upon whose account the yoke of the oppressors of the church shall be broken; but the words are variously interpreted, and I shall not contend.

39. Isa. xi. 1, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots." Targum: ויפוק מלכא מבנוהי דישי ומשיחא מבני בנוהי יתרבי;—"And a King shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and Messiah shall be anointed from the sons of his sons,"—his posterity.

Verse 6, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb." Targum: ביומוהי דמשיחא דישראל יסני שלמא בארעא;—"In the days of the Messiah of Israel peace shall be multiplied in the earth, and the wolf shall dwell with the lamb." That this chapter contains a prophecy of the Messiah and his kingdom, and that immediately and directly, all the Jews confess. Hence is that part of their usual song in the evening of the Sabbath:—

התנערי מעפר קומי
לבשי בגדי תפארתך עמי
על יד בן ישי בית הלחמי
קרבה, אל נפשי גאלה

"Shake thyself from dust, arise,
My people, clothed in glorious guise;
For from Bethlehem Jesse's Son
Brings to my soul redemption."

They call him the "Son of Jesse" from this place; which makes it somewhat observable that some Christians, as Grotius, should apply it unto Hezekiah, Judaizing in their interpretations beyond the Jews. Only the Jews are not well agreed in what sense these words, "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid," etc., are to be understood. Some would have it that the nature of the brute beasts shall be changed in the days of the Messiah: but this is rejected by the wisest of them, as Maimonides, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, and others; and these interpret the words דרך משל allegorically, applying them unto that universal peace which shall be in the world in the days of the Messiah. But the peace

they fancy is far from answering the words of the prophecy, which express a change in the nature of the worst of men by virtue of the rule and grace of the Messiah. I cannot but add, that Abarbanel, writing his commentaries about the time that the European Christian nations were fighting with the Saracens for the land of Palestine, or the Holy Land, he interprets the latter end of the tenth chapter to the destruction of them on both sides by God, whereon their Messiah should be revealed, as is promised in this, which he expresseth in the close of his exposition of the first verse of chap. xi.: תחזק מלחמה עצומה בין אומות העולם אלו עם אלו על אדמת הקדש ויפלו בה גוים עצומים חרב איש באחיו ועל זה אמר הנה הארין;—"And there shall prevail great war between the nations of the world, one against another, on" (or "for") "the Holy Land, and strong nations shall fall in it by the sword of one another; and therefore it is said, 'Behold, the Lord, the LORD of hosts, shall lop,'" chap. x. 33. And a little after he adds, מתוך אותה המלחמה יהגלה מלך המשיח;—"In the midst of that war shall Messiah the King be revealed." For those nations he would have had to be Gog and Magog: and in many places doth he express his hopes of the ruin of the Christians by that war; but the issue hath disappointed his hopes and desires.

40. Isa. xvi. 1, "Send ye the lamb to the ruler of the land." Targum, והון מסקי מסין למשיחא דישראל;—"They shall bring their tribute unto the Messiah of Israel." Observing, as it should seem, that the Moabites, unto whom these words are spoken, were never after this time tributary to Judah, and withal considering the prophecy of verse 5, which he applies also (and that properly) unto the Messiah, the Targumist conceived him to be the מוֹשֵׁל, or "ruler," here mentioned, unto whom the Moabites are invited to yield obedience; and I conceive it will not be very easy to fix upon a more genuine sense of the words. So also, verse 5, "Then shall the throne of the Messiah of Israel be prepared in goodness." Doubtless with more truth than those Christians make use of who wrest these words also to Hezekiah!

41. Isa. xxviii. 5, "In that day shall the LORD of hosts be for a crown of glory." Targum, משיחא דיי צבאות;—"The Messiah of the Lord of hosts;" the Lord of hosts in and with the Messiah, who is the crown of glory and diadem of beauty in his kingly office and rule unto the remnant of his people that shall be saved by him.

42. Isa. xlii. 1, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect." Targum, הא עבדי משיחא;—"Behold my servant the Messiah." How much better than the translation of the LXX., *Ἰακὼβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ, Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου*, applying the words to the whole people of Israel, whereas they are expressly referred to the Lord Christ, Matt. xii. 17, 18. And Kimchi on this place, הן עבדי והו מלך משיח;—"'Behold my servant;' that is, Messiah the King." And

Abarbanel confutes both R. Saadias and Aben Ezra with sharpness, who were otherwise minded. How much better than he of late who interprets these words of Isaiah himself, unto whom not one letter of the prophecy can receive any tolerable accommodation! It is the Messiah, then, by their own confession, who is intended in this prophecy; who is described not *on horseback in his harness*, as a great warrior, such as they expect him, but as one filled with the Spirit of the Lord, endowed with *meekness*, suffering opposition and persecution, bringing forth righteousness and truth unto the Gentiles, who shall wait for his law, and receive it, when it is rejected by the Jews, as the event hath manifested. Isa. xliii. 10, "My servant whom I have chosen." Targum, "My servant Messiah, in whom I rest."

43. Isa. lii. 13, "Behold, my servant shall prosper." Targum, הא יצלח עבדי משיחא;—"Behold, my servant the Messiah shall prosper." In these words begins that prophecy which takes up the remainder of this chapter, and that whole chapter that follows, in the tenth verse whereof there is mention made again of the Messiah. And this is an evidence to me that the Jews, however bold and desperate in corrupting the sense of the Scripture to countenance their infidelity, yet have not dared to intermeddle with the letter itself, no, not in the Targums, which are not so sacred with them as the text; for whereas the application of this prophecy unto the Messiah is perfectly destructive to their whole present persuasion and religion, with all the hopes they have in this world or for another, yet they never durst attempt the corrupting of the Targum, where it is done so plainly, which yet for many generations they had in their own power, scarce any notice being taken of it by any Christians in the world. But concerning this place we must deal with them afterwards at large.

44. Jer. xxiii. 5, "I will raise unto David a righteous Branch." Targum, ואקים לדוד משיחא דצדיקא;—"And I will raise up unto David Messiah the righteous." This is he who in the next verse is called יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ,—"Jehovah our righteousness." The Jews generally agree that it is the Messiah who is here intended; and whereas a late Christian expositor would have Zerubbabel to be designed in these words, Abarbanel himself gives many reasons why it cannot be applied unto any one under the second temple: "For," saith he, "during that space no one reigned as king of the house of David; nor did Judah and Israel dwell then in safety and security, they being continually oppressed, first by the Persians, then by the Grecians, and lastly by the Romans." So he, and truly. And I see no reason why one should pervert the promises concerning the Messiah, when they cannot tolerably accommodate them unto any other.

For the preservation of the name of this "righteous Branch," יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ, "Jehovah our righteousness," we may bless God for the

original; for the old translations are either mistaken, or corrupt, or perverted in this place. The Vulgar Latin is the best of them, which reads, "Dominus justus noster,"—"Our righteous Lord;" which yet corrupts the sense, and gives us an expression that may be assigned unto any righteous king.

The LXX., far worse, Καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν Κύριος, Ἰωσεδέκ·—"And this is the name that the Lord shall call him, Josedec:"—a corrupt word formed out of the two Hebrew words in the original, signifying nothing, but perverted as it were on purpose to despoil the Messiah of his glorious name, the evidence of his eternal deity. Symmachus, Κύριε, δικαίωσον ἡμᾶς,—"Lord, justify us." He seems, as one observes, to have read צִדְּקֵנוּ in Pihel; but yet this also obscures the text.

The Chaldee, according unto its usual manner when any thing occurs which its author understood not, gives us a gloss of its own sufficiently perverting the sense of the place. יתעאבון לנא זכון מן קדם יי ביומוהי;—"Let righteousness come forth to us from before the Lord in his days." Let them consider this instance,—which is but one of many that may be given,—who are ready to despise the original text, to prefer translations before it, and to cherish suspicions of its being corrupted by the Jews, or of their arbitrary invention of its points or vowels, whereby the sense of the words is fixed and limited. Can there be any clearer acquitment of them in this matter than this certain observation, that every place almost which bears testimony unto any thing concerning the Messiah which is denied by them, is far more clear in the original than in any old translation whatever? And hereof we have an eminent instance in this place, where this name, denoting undeniably *the divine nature* of the Messiah, is preserved entire only in the original, and that as it is pointed, as some fancy, by some Jewish Masoretes, who lived they know not where nor when. And those amongst ourselves who are ready to give countenance unto such opinions, or to admire the promoters of them, may do well to consider what reflection they cast thereby on that translation which is in use among us by the command of authority; than which there is no one extant in the world that is more religiously observant of the Hebrew text, and that as pointed in their Bibles; nor hath it any regard unto any or all translations, where they differ from the original, as may be seen with especial respect unto that of the LXX., the stream that feeds most of the rest, in above a *thousand places.* But this by the way.

One of late hath applied this name unto the people of Israel, and interprets the words, "Deus nobis bene fecit;"—"God hath done well unto us." But we have had too much of such bold and groundless conjectures about the fundamentals of our faith and worship. The Jews seek to evade this testimony by instances of the

application of this name to other things, as the altar built by Moses, the ark, and the city of Jerusalem. But it is one thing to have the name of God called on a place or thing, to bring the occasion of it unto remembrance; another, to say that this is the name of such a person, "Jehovah our righteousness." And whereas the Holy Ghost says expressly that this is his name, the Jews must give us leave to call him so and to believe him so; which is all we contend for. Of the same importance with this prophecy is that of Ezek. xxxvii. 24.

45. Jer. xxx. 21, "Their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them." Targum, [ומשיחיהון מבניהון יתגלי];—"Their king shall be anointed from amongst them, and their Messiah shall be revealed unto them." And upon his account it is that God enters into a new covenant with his people, verse 22.

Jer. xxxiii. 13, 15, For these words, "Flocks shall pass again under the hands of him that telleth them," the Targum reads, עוד יתנה יתנהון עמא על ידי משיחא;—"And the people shall be yet gathered by the Messiah." And a prophecy of him it is, no doubt, as the 15th verse makes it evident, where all the Jews acknowledge him to be intended by the "Branch of righteousness" which shall spring up unto David; who also is promised in the 6th verse as the "abundance" (or "crown") "of peace and truth." Yet one of late hath wrested this place also to Zerubbabel.

46. Hos. iii. 5, "Seek the LORD their God, and David their king." Targum, וישתמעון למשיחא בר דוד מלכהון;—"And shall obey the Messiah, the son of David, their King." The rabbins are divided about this place, some of them acknowledging the Messiah to be intended, others referring the prophecy unto the temple, or house of the sanctuary, built by the son of David; but the words themselves, with the denotation of the time for the accomplishment of this prophecy in the end of the verse, will allow of no application unto any other, and plainly discovers his mistake who would wrest this text also to Zerubbabel.

Hos. xiv. 8. Targum, [יתבון בטלל משיחהון];—"They shall sit under the shadow of their Messiah." See Cant. ii. 3.

47. Mic. iv. 8, "And thou, O tower of the flock," etc. Targum, ואתה משיחא דישראל דטמיר מן קדם חובי כנסתא דציון לך עתידא מלכותא;—"And thou, Messiah of Israel, who art hid because of the sins of the congregation of Zion, to thee the kingdom shall come." This gloss, I confess, draws upon the lees of Talmudical rabbinism; for they fancy that their Messiah was long since born, even at the appointed time, but is kept hid, they know not where, because of the sins of Israel.

48. Mic. v. 2, "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come

forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Targum, מנך קדמי יפוק משיחא למהוי עביד שולטן על ישראל;—"Out of thee shall the Messiah come forth before me, to exercise rule over Israel." This prophecy was famous among the Jews of old, as designing the place where the Messiah was to be born, which alone is done here; and its signal accomplishment is recorded, Matt. ii. 1, 5, 6; Luke ii. 4, 6, 7. And unto this day they generally acknowledge that it is the Messiah alone who is intended. And yet this consent of all the Jews, ancient and modern, with the application of it unto the *true Messiah* in the Gospel, manifesting the catholic consent of both churches, Judaical and Christian, about the sense of this place, hinders not one from interpreting this place of Zerubbabel, whose goings forth, as he supposeth, are said to be "of old, from everlasting," because he came of the ancient kingly house of David: whereas not one word of the prophecy ever had any tolerable appearance of accomplishment in him; for neither was he born at Bethlehem, nor was he the ruler over the Israel of God,—much less had he the least share or interest in those eternal goings forth which are expressed in the close of the verse. The words are an express description of the person of the Messiah; who, though he was to be born in the fulness of time at Bethlehem, yet the existence of his divine nature was "from of old, from everlasting." And the Jews know not how to evade this testimony. Rashi adds, in the interpretation of the words, only that of Ps. lxxii. 17, לִפְנֵי־שֶׁמֶשׁ יִנּוֹן שְׁמוֹ; which we have rendered, "His name shall be continued as long as the sun,"—not reaching the sense of the place. לִפְנֵי־שֶׁמֶשׁ is rendered by the Targum, וקדם מהוי שמשא,—"And before the sun was;"—an expression of eternity; as Prov. viii. 23. Kimchi and Aben Ezra would have the words respect that long season that was to be between David and the Messiah. "Bethlehem," saith Kimchi, "that is, David, who was born there." And, יש זמן רב בין דוד ובין מלך המשיח,—"There is a long time between David and the Messiah." But this gloss is forced, and hath nothing in the words to give countenance unto it. It is the Messiah that is said to be born at Bethlehem, and not David, as shall afterwards be evinced; and מוֹצָאֹתָיו denotes some acts or actings of him that is spoken of, and not his relation unto another not spoken of at all. Neither do these words, מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם, denote "a long time," but directly that which is before all times. See Prov. viii. 22. He yet proceeds to answer them who say the Messiah is God from this place, because of this description of him: and he first rejects the Lord Christ from being here intended, as supposing an objection to be made with reference unto him, though he expresses it not; for saith he, יש עליהם תשובה, "This is an answer unto them, כי הוא לא משל בישראל אבל הם משלו בו;"—"He ruled not over Israel, but they ruled over him;"

where it is evident that some sentence written by him is left out of the copies printed among Christians. But, poor, blind, blasphemous wretch! this boast hath cost him and his associates in infidelity full dear. It is true, their progenitors did unto him whatever the counsel of God had determined; but notwithstanding all their rage, he was exalted to the right hand of God, and made a Prince and a Saviour, having ruled ever since over the whole Israel of God by his word and Spirit, and over them, his stubborn enemies, with a rod of iron. He adds, that it is false that these words are applicable unto the eternity of God: for saith he, האל קודם ימי עולם היה, —"God was before the days of everlasting;" as though in the same sense God were not expressly said to be מִקֶּדֶם, as here, see Hab. i. 12, and to be "from everlasting." And this place is well expounded by Prov. viii. 22, 23, as some of the rabbins acknowledge; so that we have in it an eminent testimony given unto the person of the Messiah, as well as unto the place of his nativity, of which we shall treat afterwards.

49. Zech. iii. 8, "For, behold, I will bring forth my servant the Branch." Targum, הא אנא מיתי ית עבדי משיחא ויתגלי;—"Behold, I bring forth my servant the Messiah, who shall be revealed." This revelation of the Messiah relates unto their apprehension of his being born long since, but to lie hid because of their sins, as was before intimated. And in like manner is he three times more mentioned by the Targumist in this prophecy, chap. iv. 7, vi. 12, x. 4; in all which places he is certainly designed by the Holy Ghost. There are also many of them who acknowledge him to be intended, chap. ix. 9, xi. 12, 13, xii. 10, where he is not mentioned in the Targum.

I have not insisted on these places, as though they were all the testimonies that to the same purpose might be taken out of the Prophets, seeing they are a very small portion of the predictions concerning the person, grace, and kingdom of the Messiah, and not all those which are most eminent in that kind; but because they are such as wherein we have either the consent of all the Jews with us in their application,—from whence some advantage may be taken for their conviction,—or we have the suffrage of the more ancient and authentic masters to reprove the perverseness of the modern rabbins withal.

50. And this is He whom we inquire after,—one who was promised from the foundation of the world to relieve mankind from under that state of sin and misery whereinto they were cast by their apostasy from God. This is he who, from the first promise of him, or intimation of relief by him, was the hope, desire, comfort, and expectation of *all that aimed at reconciliation and peace with God*,—upon whom all their religion, faith, and worship was founded, and in whom it centred; he for whose sake, or for the

bringing of whom into the world, *Abraham and the Hebrews* his posterity were separated to be a peculiar people, distinct from all the nations of the earth; in the faith of whom the *whole church* in and from the days of Adam, that of the Jews in especial, celebrated its mystical worship, endured persecution and martyrdom, waiting and praying continually for his appearance; he whom *all the prophets* taught, preached, promised, and raised up the hearts of believers unto a desire and expectation of, describing beforehand his sufferings, with the glory that was to ensue; he of whose coming a *catholic tradition* was spread over the world, which the old serpent, with all his subtlety, was never able to obliterate.

EXERCITATION X.

APPEARANCES OF THE SON OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. Ends of the promises and prophecies concerning the Messiah—Other ways of his revelation; of his oblation, by sacrifices; of his divine person, by visions. 2. What meant in the Targums by מימרא דיי, the Word of God—The expression first used, Gen. iii. 8—קוֹל יְהוָֹה, what or who—Ὁ Λόγος—Λόγος ἐνυπόστατος—Apprehensions of the ancient Jews about the Word of God; of the philosophers—Application of the expression, Ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, to the Son, by John—Expressions of Philo—Among the Mohammedans Christ called the Word of God—Intention of the Targumists vindicated. 3. How the Voice walked—Aben Ezra refuted, and R. Jona—The appearance of the second Person unto our first parents. 4. Gen. xviii. 1–3—God's appearance, כְּחֹם הַיּוֹם—Suddenness of it. 5. Who appeared. 6. The occasion of it. 7. Reflection of Aben Ezra on some Christian expositors retorted—A trinity of persons not proved from this place—Distinct persons proved—No created angel representing the person of God called Jehovah—Gen. xix. 24, "From the LORD"—Exceptions of Aben Ezra and Jarchi removed—Appearance of the second Person. 8. Gen. xxxii. 24, 26–30. 9. Occasion of this vision. 10. The Person; in appearance a man; 11. In office, an angel, Gen. xlviii. 16; 12, 13. In nature, God, Gen. xxxii. 26, 30, Hos. xii. 5—יֵאָבֵק, what—Who it was that appeared. 14. Exod. iii. 1–6, 14—God appeared. 15. Exod. xix. 18–20—Who gave the law—Not a created angel—The ministry of angels, how used therein. 16, 17. Exod. xxiii. 20–23—Different angels promised—The Angel of God's presence, who. 18, 19. Josh. v. 13–15—Captain of the Lord's host described. 20. Sense of the ancient church concerning these appearances; 21. Of the Jews. 22. Opinion of Nachmanides. 23. Tanchuma—Talmud—Fiction of the angel rejected by Moses, accepted by Joshua—Sense of it. 24. Metatron, who—Derivation of the name.

1. WE have seen how plentifully God instructed the church of old by his prophets in the knowledge of the person, office, and work of the Messiah. And this he did, partly that nothing might be wanting unto the faith and consolation of believers, in a suitableness and proportion unto that condition of light and grace wherein it was his good pleasure to keep them before his actual coming; and partly

that his righteous judgments, in the rejection and ruin of those who obstinately refused him, might, from the means of their conviction, be justified and rendered glorious. Neither were these promises and predictions alone the means whereby God would manifest and reveal him unto their faith.

There are two things concerning the Messiah which are the pillars and foundation of the church. The one is his *divine nature;* and the other, his work of mediation in the *atonement* for sin, which he was to make by his suffering, or the sacrifice of himself. For the declaration of these unto them who, according unto the promise, looked for his coming, there were two especial ways or means graciously designed of God. The latter of these ways was that *worship* which he instituted, and the various *sacrifices* which he appointed to be observed in the church, as types and representations of that one perfect oblation which he was to offer in the fulness of time. The unfolding and particular application of this way of instruction is the principal design and scope of the apostle Paul in his Epistle unto the Hebrews. Whereas, therefore, that must be at large insisted on in our Exposition of that Epistle, I shall not anticipate what is to be spoken concerning it in these previous discourses, which are all intended to be in a subserviency thereunto. The other way, which concerns his divine person, was by those *visions* and *appearances* of the Son of God, as the head of the church, which were granted unto the fathers under the old testament. And these, as they are directly suited unto our purpose, in our inquiry after the prognostics of the advent of the Messiah, so are they eminently useful for the conviction of the Jews; for in them we shall manifest that a revelation was made of a *distinct person* in the Deity, who in a peculiar manner did manage all the concernments of the church after the entrance of sin. And herein, also, according unto our proposed method, we shall inquire what light concerning this truth hath been received by any of the Jewish masters; as also manifest what confusion they are driven unto, when they seek to evade the evidence that is in the testimonies to this purpose.

2. There is frequent mention in the Targumists of מימרא דיי, "The Word of the Lord;" and it first occurs in them on the first appearance of a divine person after the sin and fall of Adam, Gen. iii. 8. The words of the original text are, וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִתְהַלֵּךְ בַּגָּן; —"And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden." The participle מִתְהַלֵּךְ, "walking," may be as well referred unto קוֹל, "the voice," as unto יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, "the LORD God:" "Vocem Domini Dei ambulantem." And although קוֹל most commonly signifies λόγον προφορικόν, or "verbum prolatum," the outward voice and sound thereof, yet when applied unto God, it frequently denotes λόγον ἐνδιάθετον, "his almighty power," whereby he effecteth what-

ever he pleaseth. So Ps. xxix. 3–9, those things are ascribed קוֹל יְהוָה, to this "voice of the LORD," which elsewhere are assigned τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, Heb. i. 3, to "the word of his power;" which the Syriac renders by "the power of his word," intending the same thing. Now, all these mighty works of creation or providence, which are assigned לְקוֹל יְהוָה, to this "voice of the LORD," or τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως, to "the word of his power," or "his powerful word," are immediately wrought *per* Λόγον οὐσιώδη or ἐνυπόστατον,—by the essential Word of God, John i. 3, Col. i. 16; which was with God "in the beginning," or at the creation of all things, John i. 1, 2, as his eternal wisdom, Prov. viii. 22–26, and power. This expression, therefore, of קוֹל יְהוָה may also denote τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the Word of God that is God, the essential Word of God, the person of the Son: for here our first parents heard this "Word walking in the garden" before they heard the outward sound of any voice or words whatever; for God spake not unto them until after this: Gen. iii. 9, "The LORD God called unto Adam, and said unto him."

And this change of the appearance of God some of the Jews take notice of. So the author of Tseror Hammor, Sect. Bereshith: קורם החטא היו רואים כבוד ה' מדבר עמם ועכשיו שחטאו לא ראוהו אלא שמעו קולו מתהלך בגן;—"Before they sinned they saw the glory of the blessed God speaking with them; but after their sin they only heard his voice walking." God dealt now otherwise with them than he did before. And the Chaldee paraphrast, observing that some especial presence of God is expressed in the words, renders them, ושמעו ית־קל מימרא דיי אלהים מתהלך בגנתא;—"And they heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden." So all the Targums; and that of Jerusalem begins the next verse accordingly, וקרא מימרא דיי אלהים לאדם;—"And the Word of the Lord God called unto Adam." And this expression they afterwards make use of in places innumerable, and that in such a way as plainly to denote a distinct person in the Deity. That this also was their intendment in it is hence manifest, because about the time of the writing of the first of those Targums, which gave "normam loquendi," the rule of speaking unto them that followed, it was usual amongst them to express their conceptions of the Son of God by the name of ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, or "the Word of God," the same with מימרא דיי.

So doth Philo express their sense, De Confusione Linguarum: Κἂν μηδέπω μέντοι τυγχάνῃ τὶς ἀξιόχρεως ὢν υἱὸς Θεοῦ προσαγορεύεσθαι, σπούδαζε κοσμεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον. τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα· καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ, καὶ ὄνομα Θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος, καὶ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὁρῶν Ἰσραὴλ προσαγορεύεται·—"If any be not yet worthy to be called the son of God, yet endeavour thou to be conformed unto his first-begotten Word, the most ancient angel, the archangel with many names; for he is called the

Beginning, the Name of God, the Man according to the image of God, the Seer of Israel." How suitably these things are spoken unto the mysteries revealed in the Gospel shall elsewhere be declared. Here I only observe how he calls that Angel which appeared unto the fathers, and that sometimes in human shape, the Word, "The first-begotten Word." And he expresseth himself again to the same purpose: Καὶ γὰρ οἱ μήπω ἱκανοὶ Θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλά τοι τῆς ἀϊδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, Λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου, Θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν Λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος·—"For if we are not yet meet to be called the sons of God, let us be so of his eternal image, the most sacred Word; for that most ancient Word is the image of God." How these things answer the discourses of our apostle about Jesus Christ, Col. i. 15–18, Heb. i. 3, is easily discerned. And this conception of theirs was so far approved by the Holy Ghost, as suitable unto the mind of God, that John in the beginning of his Gospel, declaring the eternal deity of Christ, doth it under this name of ὁ Λόγος, "the Word," that is, מימר דיי, "the Word of God:" "The Word was with God, and the Word was God," John i. 1. For as he alludeth therein to the story of the first creation, wherein God is described as making all things by his word; for he said of every thing, "Let it be," and it was made; (as the psalmist expresseth it, "He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast," Ps. xxxiii. 9: which he fully declares, verse 6, "By the word of the LORD were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth:" in answer whereunto John teacheth that all things were made by this Word of God whereof he speaks, chap. i. 3: which in the Chaldee is elsewhere also assigned unto this Word, where mention is not made of it in the original, as Isa. xlv. 12, and chap. xlviii. 13; whence it is in like manner expressed by Peter, 2 Epist. iii. 5;)—so he might have respect unto that ascription of the work of the redemption of the church to this Word of the Lord which was admitted in the church of the Jews. That place, amongst others, is express to this purpose, Hos. i. 7, where the words of the prophet, "I will save them by the LORD their God," are rendered by the Targumist, ואפרקנון במימרא דיי אלההון;—"I will save" (or "redeem") "them by the Word of the Lord their God;" the Word, the Redeemer. And it is not unworthy of consideration, that as the wisest and most contemplative of the philosophers of old had many notions about ὁ Λόγος ἀΐδιος, "the eternal Word," which was unto them δύναμις τῆς ὅλης κτίσεως ποιητική, "the formative or creative power of the universe,"—to which purpose many sayings have been observed, and might be reported, out of Plato, with his followers, Amelius, Chalcidius, Proclus, Plotinus, and others; whose expressions are imitated by our own writers, as Justin Martyr, Clemens, Athenagoras, Tatian, and many more;—so among the Mohammedans themselves

this is the name that in their Koran they give unto Jesus, כלמה אללה,—"The Word of God." So prevalent hath this notion of the Son of God been in the world. And as these words, Ezek. i. 24, "I heard the voice of their wings, כְּקוֹל־שַׁדַּי," "as the voice of the Almighty," are rendered by the Targumist, כקלא מין קדם שדי, "as the voice from the face of the Almighty,"—which what it is shall be afterwards shown,—so some copies of the LXX. render them by φωνὴν τοῦ Λόγου, "the voice of the Word," that is, of God, who was represented in that vision, as shall be manifested.

Some would put another sense on that expression of the Targumists, as though it intended nothing but God himself. And instances of the use of it in that sense have been observed: as, Eccles. viii. 17, "If a wise man say במי מלה," "in his word,"—that is, say in himself; Gen. vi. 6, "It repented the LORD במי מלה," "in his word." Also, Ruth iii. 8 is urged to give countenance unto this suspicion: "As did Phaltiel the son of Laish, who placed his sword בין מימרי ובין מיכל בת שאול," "between his word and Michal the daughter of Saul, the wife of David." But,—(1.) The former places use not the word מימר, which is peculiar unto the sense contended for; (2.) The Targums on the Hagiographa are a late post-Talmudical endeavour, made in imitation of those of Onkelos and Ben Uzziel, when the Jews had lost both all sense of their old traditions and use of the Chaldee language, any other than what they learned from those former paraphrases. Nothing, therefore, can hence be concluded as to the intention of the Targumists in these words. And they can have no other sense in that of Psalm cx. 1, אמר יי במימריה;—"The LORD said in" (or "to") "his Word;" for, "to my Lord," as in the original.

3. The Jews discern that מִתְהַלֵּךְ, "walking," relates in this place immediately to קוֹל, "the voice," and not unto יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, "the LORD God;" and therefore endeavour to render a reason for that kind of expression. So Aben Ezra on the place giveth instances where a voice or sound in its progress is said to walk: as Exod. xix. 19, קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר הוֹלֵךְ וְחָזֵק;—"The voice of the trumpet went and waxed strong;" and Jer. xlvi. 22, קוֹלָהּ כַּנָּחָשׁ יֵלֵךְ;—"The voice thereof shall go like a serpent." But these examples reach not that under consideration; for although הָלַךְ may sometimes express the progression or increase of a voice, yet it doth not so but where it is intimated to be begun before. But here was nothing spoken by God until after that Adam had heard this Word of God walking. And therefore R. Jona, cited by Aben Ezra, would apply מִתְהַלֵּךְ, "walking," unto Adam,—he heard the voice of God as he was himself walking in the garden; the absurdity of which fiction the words of the text and context sufficiently evince, for not מִתְהַלֵּךְ, but מִתְהַלְּכִים would answer unto יִשְׁכְּעוּ in the beginning of the verse. It is

therefore most *probable*, that, in the great alteration which was now coming upon the whole creation of God,—mankind being to be cast out of covenant, the serpent and the earth being to be cursed, and a way of recovery for the elect of God to be revealed,—He by whom all things were made, and by whom all were to be renewed that were to be brought again unto God, did in an especial and glorious manner appear unto our first parents, as he in whom this whole dispensation centred, and unto whom it was committed. And as, after the promise given, he appeared ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, "in a human shape," to instruct the church in the mystery of his future incarnation, and under the name of Angel, to shadow out his office as sent unto it and employed in it by the Father; so here, before the promise, he discovered his distinct glorious person, as the eternal Voice or Word of the Father.

4. Gen. xviii. 1–3, "And the LORD appeared unto him" (Abraham) "in the plains of Mamre: and he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day; and he lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground, and said, My Lord, if now I have now found favour in thy sight," etc. The Jews, in Bereshith Ketanna, say that this appearance of God unto Abraham was three days after his circumcision; from the sore whereof, being not recovered, he sat in the door of his tent; and that God came to visit him in his sickness. But the reason of his sitting in the door of the tent is given in the text, namely, because it was כְּחֹם הַיּוֹם,—"as in" (or "about") "the heat of the day," as the day grew hot; in an opposition unto the time of God's appearance unto Adam, which was לְרוּחַ הַיּוֹם,—"in the cool air of the day." For as, when God comes to curse, nothing shall refresh the creature, though in its own nature suited thereunto,—it shall wither in the cool of the day; so when he comes to bless, nothing shall hinder the influence of it upon his creatures, however any thing in itself may, like the heat of the day, be troublesome or perplexing.

5. "He lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him." The title is, וַיֵּרָא אֵלָיו יְהוָה,—"The LORD appeared unto him;" and the narrative is, "Lo, three men stood by him;" the LORD, therefore, was amongst them. And it seems to be a sudden appearance that was made to him; he saw them on a sudden standing by him; he looked up and saw them: and this satisfied him that it was a heavenly apparition.

6. The business of God with Abraham at this time, was to renew unto him the promise of the blessing Seed, and to confine it unto his posterity by Sarah, now when he was utterly hopeless thereof, and began to desire that Ishmael might be the heir thereof. Unto this signal work of mercy was adjoined the intimation of an emi-

nent effect of *vindictive justice*, wherein God would set forth an example of it unto all ensuing generations, in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. And both these were the proper works of him on whom the care of the church was in an especial manner incumbent,—all whose blessedness depended on that promise,—and to whom the rule of the world, the present and future judgment thereof, is committed; that is, the person of the Son. And hence, in the overthrow of those cities, he who is to be their judge is said to set forth an ensample of his future dealing with ungodly men, 2 Pet. ii. 6.

7. Aben Ezra reflects with scorn on the Christians who from this place, because three men are said to appear unto Abraham, and he calls them, "My Lord," would prove the tri-personality of the Deity: הנה קצת אמרו כי השם ג' אנשים הוא אחד והוא ג' ולא יתפרדו;—"Because of the appearance of three men, God is three, and he is one, and they are not separated or divided." How then doth he answer what they say? והנה שכחו ויבאו שני המלאכים סדומה;—"Behold, they forget that there came two angels unto Sodom;" that is, that two of those who appeared were angels, and no more. But if any Christians have taken these three persons to have been the three persons of the Trinity, it were an easy thing to outbalance their mistake with instances of his own and companions' pernicious curiosities and errors. It is true, a trinity of persons in the Deity cannot be proved from this place, seeing one of them is expressly called Jehovah, and the other two, in distinction from him, are said to be angels; so, and no more, Gen. xix. 1. But yet a distinction of persons in the Deity, although not the precise number of them, is hence demonstrable. for it is evident that he of the three that spake unto Abraham, and to whom he made his supplication for the sparing of Sodom, was Jehovah, "the Judge of all the earth," chap. xviii. 22–33; and yet all the three were sent upon the work, that one being the Prince and Head of the embassy; as he who is Jehovah is said to be sent by Jehovah, Zech. ii. 8, 9. Neither is there any ground for the late exposition of this and the like places, namely, that a created angel representing the person of God doth both speak and act in his name, and is called Jehovah; an invention to evade the appearances of the Son of God under the old testament, contrary to the sense of all antiquity, nor is any reason or instance produced to make it good. The Jews, indeed, say that they were three angels, because of the threefold work they were employed in; for they say, "No more than one angel is at any time sent about the same work." So one of these was to renew the promise unto Abraham; another, to deliver Lot; and the third, to destroy Sodom. But besides that this is a rule of their own making, and evidently false, as may be seen, Gen. xxxii. 1, 2; 2 Kings vi. 17; so in the story itself it is manifest that they were all employed in the

same work,—one as Lord and Prince, the other two as his ministering servants.

And this is further cleared in that expression of Moses, Gen. xix. 24, "The LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven." Targum, מקדם דיי, "from before the Lord," or "the face of the Lord." Aben Ezra answers, לשון צחות והטעם מאתו,—that this is the elegancy of the tongue, and the sense of it is, "from himself;" and this gloss some of our late critics embrace. And there are instances collected by Solomon Jarchi to confirm this sense,—namely, the words of Lamech, Gen. iv. 23, "Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech," not "my wives;" and of David, 1 Kings i. 33, "Take with you the servants of your lord," not "my servants;" and of Ahasuerus unto Mordecai, Esther viii. 8, "Write ye for the Jews in the king's name," not "in my name." But the difference of these from the words under consideration is wide and evident. In all these places the persons are introduced speaking of themselves, and describe themselves either by their names or offices, suitably unto the occasion and subject spoken of: but in this place it is Moses that speaketh of the Lord, and he had no occasion to repeat מֵאֵת יְהוָה, were it not to intimate the distinct persons unto whom that name, denoting the nature and self-existence of God, was proper; one whereof then appeared on the earth, the other manifesting his glorious presence in heaven. Wherefore Rashi, observing somewhat more in this expression, contents not himself with his supposed parallel places; but adds, that the בית דין is to be understood, and gives this as a rule, כל מקום שכ׳ ויי הוא ובית דינו,—"Every place where it is said, ויהוָה, 'And the LORD,' he and his house of judgment are intended"! as if God had a sanhedrim in heaven,—a fancy which they have invented to avoid the expressions which testify unto a plurality of persons in the Deity. There is therefore in this place an appearance of God in a human shape, and that of one distinct person in the Godhead, who now represented himself unto Abraham in the form and shape wherein he would dwell amongst men, when of his seed he would be "made flesh." This was one signal means whereby Abraham saw his day and rejoiced; which himself lays upon his *pre-existence* unto his incarnation, and not upon the promise of his coming, John viii. 56, 58. A solemn preludium it was unto his taking of flesh, a revelation of his divine nature and person, and a pledge of his coming in human nature to converse with men.

8. Gen. xxxii. 24, 26–30, "And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the ascending of the morning. And he said, Let me go, for the day ascendeth. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be

called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore dost thou ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." This story is twice reflected upon in the Scripture afterwards: once by Jacob himself, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16, "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads;" and once by the prophet Hosea, chap. xii. 3–5, "By his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the Angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto him: he found him in Beth-el, and there he spake with us; even the LORD God of hosts; the LORD is his memorial." In the first place he is called a "man:" "There wrestled a man," Gen. xxxii. 24. In the second, Jacob calls him an "Angel:" "The Angel which redeemed me," chap. xlviii. 16. And in the third, he is expressly said to be "God, the LORD God of hosts," Hos. xii. 3, 5.

9. Jacob was now passing with his whole family into the land of Canaan, to take seizure of it, by virtue of the promise, on the behalf of his posterity. At the very entrance of it he is met by his greatest adversary, with whom he had a severe contest about the promise and the inheritance itself. This was his brother Esau, who coming against him with a power which he was no way able to withstand, he feared that he would utterly destroy both his person and his posterity, Gen. xxxii. 11. In the promise about which their contest was, the blessed Seed, with the whole church-state and worship of the old testament, was included; so that it was the greatest controversy, and had the greatest weight depending on it, of any that ever was amongst the sons of men. Wherefore, to settle Jacob's right, to preserve him with his title and interest, he who was principally concerned in the whole matter doth here appear unto him; some especial particulars of which manifestation of himself may be remarked.

10. First, He appeared in the form of "a man:" וַיֵּאָבֵק אִישׁ עִמּוֹ; —"A man wrestled with him." A man he is called from his shape and his actions. He "wrestled," וַיֵּאָבֵק; that is, saith R. Menachem in Rashi, יתעפר, "he dusted." This, saith he, is the sense of אָבָק; for שהיו מעלים עפר ברגלים,—"they stirred up the dust with their feet," as men do in earnest wrestling; or, as himself would have it, in allusion to another word, to signify "the closing with their arms," to cast one another down, as is the manner of wrestlers. A great contention is denoted, and an appearance in the form of a man, further manifested by his "touching the hollow of Jacob's thigh."

11. Secondly, He is called an "Angel" by Jacob himself: Gen. xlviii. 16, "The Angel that redeemed me." This was the greatest danger that ever Jacob was in, and this he remembers in his blessing of Joseph's children, praying that they may have the presence of this Angel with them, who preserved him all his life, and delivered him from that imminent danger from his brother Esau. And he calls him, הַמַּלְאָךְ הַגֹּאֵל,—"The Angel the Redeemer;" which is the name of the promised Messiah, as the Jews grant, Isa. lix. 20, וּבָא לְצִיּוֹן גּוֹאֵל, —"And the Goël" (the "Redeemer") "shall come to Zion." And he is expressly called "The Angel," Hos. xii. 4.

12. Thirdly, This man in appearance, this angel in office, was in name and nature God over all, blessed for ever: for, in the first place, Jacob prays solemnly unto him for his blessing, Gen. xxxii. 26, and refuseth to let him go, or to cease his supplications, until he had blessed him. He doth so, he blesseth him, and giveth him a double pledge or token of it, in the touch of his thigh and change of his name; giving him a name to denote his prevalency with God,—that is, with himself. And from hence Jacob concludes that he had "seen God," and calls the name of the place, "The face of God." In the second place, Gen. xlviii. 16, besides that he invocates this Angel, for his presence with and blessing on the children of Joseph,—which cannot regard any but God himself without gross idolatry,—it is evident that "the Angel which redeemed him," verse 16, is the same with "the God which fed him," that is, the God of his fathers.

And this is yet more evident in the prophet: for with regard unto this story of his power over the Angel, he says, "He had power with God;" and proves it, because "he had power over the Angel, and prevailed." And he shows whereby he thus prevailed: it was by "weeping and making supplication unto him;" which he neither did nor lawfully might do unto a created angel. And therefore some of the Jews apply these words, "He wept and made supplication," unto the Angel's desire to Jacob to let him go!—foolishly enough; and yet are they therein followed by some late critics, who too often please themselves in their curiosities. Again, this Angel was he whom he found, or "who found him, in Bethel;" an account whereof we have, Gen. xxviii. 10–22, and xxxv. 1. Now, this was no other but he unto whom Jacob made his vow, and entered into solemn covenant withal that he should be his God. And therefore the prophet adds expressly in the last place, Hos. xii. 5, that it was "the LORD God of hosts" whom he intended.

13. From what hath been spoken, it is evident that he who appeared unto Jacob, with whom he earnestly wrestled, by tears and supplications, was God; and because he was sent as the angel of God, it must be some distinct person in the Deity condescending unto that office; and appearing in the form of a man, he represented his future

assumption of our human nature. And by all this did God instruct the church in the mystery of the person of the Messiah, and who it was that they were to look for in the blessing of the promised Seed.

14. Exod. iii. 1–6, "And Moses came to the mountain of God, to Horeb. And the Angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I. And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God." And herein also have we expressed another glorious appearance of the Son of God. He who is here revealed is called "Jehovah," verse 4; and he affirms of himself that he is "the God of Abraham," verse 6; who also describes himself by the glorious name of "I AM THAT I AM," verse 14; in whose name and authority Moses dealt with Pharaoh in the deliverance of the people, and whom they were to serve on that mountain upon their coming out of Egypt; he whose רָצוֹן, or "merciful good-will," Moses prays for, Deut. xxxiii. 16. And yet he is expressly called an "Angel," Exod. iii. 2,—namely, the Angel of the covenant, the great Angel of the presence of God, in whom was the name and nature of God. And he thus appeared that the church might know and consider who it was that was to work out their spiritual and eternal salvation, whereof that deliverance which then he would effect was a type and pledge. Aben Ezra would have the Angel mentioned verse 2, to be another from him who is called "God," verse 6: but the text will not give countenance unto any such distinction, but speaks of one and the same person throughout, without any alteration; and this was no other but the Son of God.

15. Exod. xix. 18–20, "And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the LORD came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount." The Jews well interpret these words concerning the descent of God, to be by way of the manifestation of his glory, not change of place. And hence Aben Ezra interprets that expression, chap. xx. 22, "Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven." God was still in heaven when his glory was on

the mount. Yet these words, מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם, do rather refer to his descent, before described, than denote the place where he spake; for in giving the law, God "spake on earth," Heb. xii. 25. That God, in this glorious manifestation of his presence on mount Sinai, made use of the ministry of angels, both the nature of the thing declares, and the Scripture testifies, Ps. lxviii. 17. The voices, fire, trembling of the mountain, smoke, and noise of the trumpet, were all effected by them; and so also was the forming of the words of the law conveyed unto the ears of Moses and the people. Hence the law is not only said to be received by them εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, Acts vii. 53,—"by the disposition" or orderly ministries "of angels;" and to be disposed by them into the hand of Moses, Gal. iii. 19; but is also called ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος, Heb. ii. 2,—"the word spoken" (or "pronounced") "by angels," that is, outwardly and audibly. As to him that presided and ruled the whole action, some Christians think it was a *created angel*, representing God, and speaking in his name. But if this be so, we have no certainty of any thing that is affirmed in the Scripture, that it may be referred directly and immediately unto God, but we may, when we please, substitute a *delegated angel* in his room; for in no place, not [even] in that concerning the creation of the world, is God himself more expressly spoken of. Besides, the psalmist in the place mentioned affirms, that when those chariots of God were on mount Sinai, Jehovah himself was in the midst of them. And this presence of God the Hebrews call הכבוד, and שכינה, and יקר; whereby they now understand a majestatical and sanctifying presence; indeed, it intends him who is the "brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person," who was delegated unto this work as the great Angel of the covenant, giving the law "in the strength of the LORD, in the majesty of the name of the LORD his God."

16. Exod. xxiii. 20–22, "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries." The Angel here promised is he that went in the midst of the people in the wilderness, whose glory appeared and was manifested among them. And, moreover, another angel is promised unto them, verse 23, "For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites," etc., "and I will cut them off." It is a ministering angel, to execute the judgments and vengeance of God upon the enemies of his people. And that this angel of verse 23 is another from that of verse 20 appears from chap. xxxiii. 2, 3, compared with verses 13–16 of the same chapter. Verse 2, "I will send

an angel before thee; and I will drive out the Canaanite and the Amorite," etc.; which is the promise and the angel of chap. xxiii. 23. But saith he, chap. xxxiii. 3, "I will not go up in the midst of thee;" which he had promised to do in and by the Angel of chap. xxiii. 20, 21, in whom his name was. This the people esteemed evil tidings, and mourned because of it, chap. xxxiii. 4. Now, God had not promised to go in the midst of them any otherwise than by the Angel mentioned; which both Moses and the people were abundantly satisfied withal. But whereas he here renews his promise of the ministry and assistance of the angel of chap. xxiii. 23, yet he denies them his own presence in the Angel of verse 20, for which Moses reneweth his request, chap. xxxiii. 13; whereunto God replies, "My presence shall go with thee," verse 14: concerning which presence or face of God, or which Angel of his presence, we must a little more particularly inquire.

17. (1.) It is said to the people concerning him, הִשָּׁמֶר מִפָּנָיו, "Beware of him," or rather, "Take heed to thyself before him,"—before his face, in his presence, chap. xxiii. 21. שָׁמַר in Niphal is, "Sibi cavit," "Cave tibi." And this is the caution that is usually given the people, requiring that reverence and awe which is due unto the holiness of the presence of God. (2.) וּשְׁמַע בְּקוֹלוֹ;—"And obey his voice." This is the great precept which is solemnly given and so often reiterated in the law with reference unto God himself. (3.) אַל־תַּמֵּר בּוֹ;—"Provoke him not;" or, "Rebel not against him." This is the usual word whereby God expresseth the transgression of his covenant,—a rebellion that can be committed against God alone. (4.) Of these precepts a twofold reason is given; whereof the first is taken from the sovereign authority of this Angel: "For he will not pardon your transgressions;" that is, as Joshua afterwards tells the same people, "He is an holy God; he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins," Josh. xxiv. 19,—namely, sins of rebellion, that break and disannul his covenant. And "who can forgive sins but God?" To suppose here a created angel, is to open a door unto idolatry; for he in whose power it is absolutely to pardon and punish sin, may certainly be worshipped with religious adoration. The second reason is taken from his name: "For my name is in him,"—"a more excellent name" than any of the angels do enjoy, Heb. i. 4. He is God, Jehovah, that is his name; and his nature answereth thereunto. Hence, Exod. xxiii. 22, it is added, "If thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak." His voice is the voice of God,—in his speaking doth God speak; and upon the people's obedience thereunto depends the accomplishment of the promise. Moreover, chap. xxxiii. 14, God says concerning this Angel, פָּנַי, "My presence (my face) shall go with thee:" which presence Moses calls his "glory," verse 18, his essential glory; which was mani-

fested unto him, chap. xxxiv. 6, though but obscurely in comparison of what it was unto them who, in his human nature, wherein "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Col. ii. 9, "beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father," John i. 14. For this face of God is he whom whoso seeth he seeth the Father, John xiv. 9; because he is "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," Heb. i. 3; who accompanied the people in the wilderness, 1 Cor. x. 4; and whose merciful good pleasure towards them Moses prayed for, Deut. xxxiii. 16;—that is, "the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and every perfect gift," James i. 17. These things evidently express God, and none other; and yet he is said to be an angel sent of God, in his name, and unto his work. So that he can be no other but a certain person of the Deity who accepted of this delegation, and was therein revealed unto the church, as he who was to take upon him the seed of Abraham, and to be their eternal Redeemer.

18. Josh. v. 13–15, "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as Prince of the host of the LORD am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant? And the Prince of the LORD'S host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy." The appearance here is of a man, verse 13, "a man of war," as God is called, Exod. xv. 3, armed, with his sword drawn in his hand, as a token of the business he came about. At first sight Joshua apprehends him to be a man only; which occasioned his inquiry, "Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?" which discovers his courage and undaunted magnanimity; for doubtless the appearance was august and glorious. But he answers unto his whole question, לֹא, "I am not;" that is, a man either of your party or of the enemy's, but quite another person; "שַׂר־צְבָא־יְהוָה,"—"the Prince of the LORD'S host." And this was another illustrious manifestation of the Son of God unto the church of old, accompanied with many instructive circumstances: as,—(1.) From the *shape* wherein he appeared, namely, that of a man, as a pledge of his future incarnation. (2.) From the *title* that he assumes to himself, "The Captain of the LORD'S host," he unto whom the guidance and conduct of them unto rest, not only temporal but eternal, was committed; whence the apostle, in allusion unto this place and title, calls him "The Captain of our salvation," Heb. ii. 10. And, (3.) The *person* unto whom he spake when he gave himself this title was the captain of the people at that time; teaching both him and them that there

was another, supreme Captain of their eternal deliverance. (4.) From the *time and place* of his appearance, which was upon the first entrance of the people into Canaan, and the first opposition which therein they met withal; so engaging his presence with his church in all things which oppose them in their way unto eternal rest. (5.) From the *adoration and worship* which Joshua gave unto him; which he accepted of, contrary to the duty and practice of created angels, Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9. (6.) From the *prescription of the ceremonies* expressing religious reverence, "Put off thy shoe;" with the reason annexed, "For the place whereon thou standest קֹדֶשׁ הוּא," "it is holiness,"—made so by the presence of God: the like precept whereunto was given to Moses by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Exod. iii. 5. By all these things was the church instructed in the person, nature, and office, of the Son of God, even in the mystery of his eternal distinct subsistence in the Deity, his future incarnation and condescension unto the office of being the Head and Saviour of his church.

19. These manifestations of the Son of God unto the church of old, as the angel or messenger of the Father, subsisting in his own divine person, are all of them revelations of the promised Seed, the great and only Saviour and Deliverer of the church, in his eternal preexistence unto his incarnation; and pledges of his future taking flesh for the accomplishment of the whole work committed unto him. And many other instances of the like nature may be added out of the former and later Prophets; which, because in most important circumstances they are coincident with these, need not here particularly be insisted on.

20. Some of late would apply all these appearances unto a created delegated angel; which conceit, as it is irreconcilable unto the sacred text, as we have manifested, so is it contrary unto the sense of the ancient writers of the Christian church. A large collection of testimonies from them is not suited unto our present design and purpose; I shall therefore only mention two of the most ancient of them, one of the Latin, the other of the Greek church. The first is Tertullian, who tells us, "Christus semper egit in Dei Patris nomine; ipse ab initio conversatus est et congressus cum patriarchis et prophetis," adv. Marc. lib. ii.;—"Christ always dealt" (with men) "in the name of God the Father; and so himself from the beginning conversed with the patriarchs and prophets." And again, "Christus ad colloquia humana semper descendit, ab Adam usque ad patriarchas et prophetas, in visione, in somno, in speculo, in ænigmate, ordinem suum præstruens semper ab initio; et Deus in terris cum hominibus conversatus est non alius quam Sermo qui caro erat futurus," adv. Praxeam.;—"It was Christ who descended into communion with men, from Adam unto the patriarchs and prophets, in visions,

dreams, and appearances, or representations, of himself, instructing them in his future condition from the beginning; and God who conversed with men on earth was no other but the Word who was to be made flesh." The other is Justin Martyr, whose words need not be produced, seeing it is known how he contends for this very thing in his dialogue with Trypho.

21. That which is more direct unto our purpose, is to inquire into the apprehensions of the Jewish masters concerning the *divine appearances* insisted on, granted unto the patriarchs and church of old, with what may thence be collected for their conviction concerning the person of the Messiah. The most part of their expositors do, I confess, pass over the difficulties of the places mentioned (I mean those which are such unto their present infidelity) without taking the least notice of them. Some would have the angel mentioned to be Michael, unto whom they assign a prerogative above the other angels, who preside over other countries; but who that Michael is, and wherein that prerogative doth consist, they know not. Some say that Michael is the high priest of heaven, who offers up the prayers of the righteous: so R. Menachem. "He is the priest above, that offereth or presenteth the souls of the righteous," saith another, more agreeably unto the truth than they are aware of. One signal instance only of the evidence of the truth insisted on, in the words of Moses Nachmanides Gerundensis, on Exod. xxiii., which hath been taken notice of by many, shall at present suffice. His words are: "Iste Angelus, si rem ipsam dicamus, est Angelus Redemptor, de quo scriptum est, 'Quoniam nomen meum in ipso est;' ille inquam Angelus qui ad Jacob dicebat, Gen. xxxi. 13, 'Ego Deus Bethel;' ille de quo dictum est, Exod. iii. 4, 'Et vocabat Mosen Deus de rubo.' Vocatur autem Angelus quia mundum gubernat: scriptum est enim, Deut. vi. 21, 'Eduxit vos Jehovah ex Ægypto;' et alibi, Num. xx. 16, 'Misit Angelum suum, et eduxit vos ex Ægypto.' Præterea scriptum est, Esa. lxiii. 9, 'Et Angelus faciei ejus salvos fecit ipsos,'—nimirum ille Angelus cui est Dei facies; de quo dictum est, Exod. xxxiii. 14, 'Facies mea præibit, et efficiam ut quiescas.' Denique, ille Angelus est de quo vates, Mal. iii. 1, 'Et subito veniet ad templum suum Dominus, quem vos quæritis, et Angelus fœderis, quem cupitis.'" And again to the same purpose: "Animadverte attentè quid ista sibi velint, 'Facies mea præibit;' Moses enim et Israelitæ semper optaverunt angelum primum, cæterum quis ille esset vere intelligere non potuerunt, neque enim ab aliis percipiebant, neque prophetica notione satis assequebantur. Atqui 'facies Dei' ipsum Deum significat, quod apud omnes interpretes est in confesso. Verum ne per somnium quidem ista intelligere quisquam possit, nisi sit in mysteriis legis eruditus." And again: "'Facies mea præcedet;' hoc est, 'Angelus fœderis, quem vos cupitis, in quo videbitur facies mea;' de quo

dictum est, 'Tempore accepto exaudiam te; nomen meum in eo est; faciamque ut quiescas; sive efficiam ut ipse tibi sit lenis et benignus, neque te ducat per rigidum, sed placide et clementer;'"—"This Angel, if we speak exactly, is the Angel the Redeemer, concerning whom it is written, 'My name is in him,' Exod. xxiii. 21; that Angel who said unto Jacob, 'I am the God of Bethel,' Gen. xxxi. 13; he of whom it is said, 'And God called unto Moses out of the bush.' Exod. iii. 4. And he is called an Angel because he governeth the world: for it is written, Deut. vi. 21. 'The LORD brought us out of Egypt;' and elsewhere, Num. xx. 16, 'He sent his Angel, and brought us out of Egypt.' Moreover, it is written, Isa. lxiii. 9, 'And the Angel of his face (presence) saved them,'—namely, that Angel who is the face of God; of whom it is said, Exod. xxxiii. 14, 'My face shall go before thee, and I will cause thee to rest.' Lastly, it is that Angel of whom the prophet speaks, Mal. iii. 1, 'And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, the Angel of the covenant, whom ye delight in.'" His following words are to the same purpose: "Mark diligently what is the meaning of these words, 'My face shall go before thee;' for Moses and the Israelites always desired the chiefest Angel, but who that was they could not truly understand, for neither could they learn it of any others nor obtain it by prophecy. But the 'face of God' signifieth God himself, as all interpreters acknowledge. But no man can have the least knowledge hereof unless he be skilled in the mysteries of the law." He adds moreover: "'My face shall go before thee,' that is, 'the Angel of the covenant, whom ye desire, in whom my face shall be seen;' of whom it is said, 'In an acceptable time have I heard thee; my name is in him; I will cause thee to rest, or cause that he shall be gentle or kind unto thee, nor shall lead thee with rigour, but quietly and mercifully.'"

22. This R. Moses Bar Nachman wrote about the year of the Lord 1220, in Spain, and died at Jerusalem anno 1260, and he is one of the chiefest masters of the Jews. And there are many things occurring in his writings beyond the common rate of their present apprehensions, as in the places cited he doth plainly evert one of the principal foundations of their present infidelity: for he not only grants, but contends and proves, that the Angel spoken of was God; and being sent of God as his angel, he must be a *distinct person* in the Deity, as we have proved. The reason, indeed, he fixeth on why he is called an Angel, namely, "because he governeth the world," although the thing in itself be true, is not so proper; for he is so called because of his eternal designation and actual delegation by the Father unto the work of saving the church, in all conditions from first to last. And as he acknowledgeth that his being called "The face of God" proves him to be God, so it doth no less evidently

evince his personal distinction from him whose face he is,—that is, "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person." And what he adds of the mercy and benignity which, by the appointment of God, he exerciseth towards his people, is signally suitable unto the tenderness and mercy which the great Captain of our salvation exerciseth by God's appointment towards all those whom he leads and conducts unto glory.

23. It is also not unworthy consideration what some of them write in Tanchuma, an ancient comment on the five books of Moses. Speaking of the Angel that went before them, from Exod. xxiii. 20, "God," say they, "said unto Moses, 'Behold, I send my Angel before thy face.' But Moses answered, 'I will not have an angel, but I will have thyself.' But when Joshua the son of Nun first saw the angel, he said, 'Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?' Then the angel answered, 'I am the Captain of the LORD'S host, and now I come.' As if he had said, 'I am come a second time, that I may lead the Israelites into their possession. I came when Moses thy master was the ruler; but when he saw me, he would not have me to go with him, but refused me.' As soon as Joshua heard this, he fell on his face and worshipped, saying, 'What speaketh my Lord unto his servant?'"

Answerable hereunto in the Talmud. Tractat. Sanhed., cap. iv., Echad dine Mamonoth, they have a gloss on these words, Exod. xxiii. 21, לֹא יִשָּׂא לְפִשְׁעֲכֶם;—"He will not pardon your transgressions:" לא יכול הכלוח לפשעכם ומה יתדן בהאמר ליה הימכותא בידן שאין בוכח לשאת פשעינו ואנו כמו מאסכוהו ומאינו לבלו אפילו לפדוונקא שליח מוציא ומביא;—"'He cannot spare or pardon your transgressions;' what then doth he do, or could he do? Wherefore he said unto him" (to God), "'We believe that he cannot pardon our transgressions, and therefore we refuse him, and will not accept of him; no, not for a leader to go in and out before us.'" They greatly mistake in supposing that the angel whom alone Moses refused was he that afterwards appeared unto Joshua; for he was the same with him in whom was the "name of God," and who was promised unto them under the name of the face or presence of God. But herein they were right enough, that not Moses, but their church under the law, refused that "Angel of God's presence," who was to conduct them that obey him into everlasting rest. And the church of believers under Joshua, which was a type of the church of the new testament, adhering unto him, found rest unto their souls.

24. And this Angel of whom we have spoken was he whom the Talmudists call מטטרון, "Metatron." Ben Uzziel, in his Targum on Gen. v., ascribes this name unto Enoch. He ascended, saith he, into heaven, by the word of the Lord, וקרא שמיה מיטטרון ספרא רבא,—"and his name was called Metatron, the great scribe." But this

opinion is rejected and confuted in the Talmud. There they tell us that "Metatron" is שר העלם,—"the prince of the world;" or, as Elias calls him in Tishbi, שר הפנים,—"the prince of God's presence." The mention of this name is in Talmud. Tract. Sanhed., cap. iv., where they plainly intimate that they intend an uncreated Angel thereby; for they assign such things unto him as are incompetent to any other. And, as Reuchlin informeth us from the Cabbalists, they say, רבי של משה מטטרון;—"Metatron was the master or teacher of Moses himself." "He it is," saith Elias, "who is the angel always appearing in the presence of God; of whom it is said, 'My name is in him.'" And the Talmudists add, that he hath power to blot out the sins of Israel; whence they call him "The chancellor of heaven." And Bechai, a famous master among them, affirms that his name signifies both a lord, a messenger, and a keeper, on Exod. xxiii.;—a *lord*, because he ruleth all; a *messenger*, because he standeth always before God, to do his will; and a *keeper*, because he keepeth Israel. The etymology, I confess, which he gives unto this purpose of that name is weak and foolish; nor is that of Elias one jot better, who tells us that "Metatron" is בלשון יון, in the Greek tongue, "one sent." But yet it is evident what is intended by these obscure intimations, which are the corrupted relics of ancient traditions, namely, the uncreated Prince of glory, who, being Lord of all, appeared of old unto the patriarchs as the angel or messenger of the Father. And as for the word itself, it is either a corrupt expression of the Latin, "mediator," such as is usual amongst them, or a mere gematrical fiction, to answer unto שדי, the "Almighty," there being a coincidence in the numerical signification of their letters.

And this was another way whereby God instructed the church of old in the mystery of the person of the Messiah who was promised unto them.

EXERCITATION XI.

FAITH OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH OF THE JEWS CONCERNING THE MESSIAH.

1. Messiah promised of old. 2. Faith of the ancient church of the Jews concerning him. 3. State of the Jews at his coming—Expectations of it exposed to the seducements of impostors. 4. Faith of their forefathers lost among them—Sadducees expected a Messiah—On what grounds—Consistency of their principles. 5. True Messiah rejected by them—General reason thereof. 6 Story of Bar-Cosba, and Rabbi Akiba—Miracles to be wrought by the Messiah. 7. State of the Jews after the days of Bar Cosba—Faith of their forefathers utterly renounced. 8. Opinion of Hillel, denying any Messiah to come—Occasion of it—Their judgment of him. 9. The things concern-

ing the Messiah mysterious—Seeming inconsistencies in the prophecies and descriptions of him. 10. Reconciled in the gospel—That rejected by the Jews. 11. Their imagination of two Messiahs, Messiah Ben Joseph and Messiah Ben David—Story of Messiah Ben Joseph. 12. Of Armillus. 13. Rise and occasion of the fable concerning him—Jews acquainted with the Book of Revelation. 14. Their story of the building of Rome—אבא קיון, what. 15. Death of Ben Joseph. 16, 17. The fable concerning him disproved—The same with that of the Romanists concerning Antichrist. 18. Of Messiah Ben David—The faith and expectation of the Jews concerning him. 19. The opinion of Maimonides. 20. Sum of the Judaical creed. 21. Ground and reason of their present unbelief. 22. Ignorance of their miserable condition by nature. 23. Ignorance of acceptable righteousness; 24. And of the judgment of God concerning sin; 25, 26. Also of the nature and end of the law. 27. Corrupt affections. 28. Envy against the Gentiles, because of the privileges claimed by them; 29. And their oppressions. 30. Judaical faith concerning the Messiah. 31. The folly of it. 32. Of the promises of the Old Testament. 33–35. Threefold interpretation of them. 36. Conclusion.

1. We have proved the promise of a *person* to be born and anointed unto the work of relieving mankind from sin and misery, and to bring them back unto God; and what kind of person he was to be we have also showed. It remains that we consider what was the *faith of the ancient church of the Jews* concerning him; as also what are, and have been for many generations, the apprehensions and expectations of the *same people* about the same object of faith, with the *occasions* and *reasons* of their present infidelity and obstinacy.

2. For the faith of the ancient church, it hath been already sufficiently discoursed. What God *revealed*, that they *believed*. They of old saw not, indeed, clearly and fully into the sense of the promises,—as to the way and manner whereby God would work out and accomplish the mercy and grace which they lived and died in the faith and hope of; but this they knew, that God would, in his *appointed time*, in and by the *nature of man*, in one to be born of the seed of Abraham and house of David, cause *atonement* to be made for sin, bring in *everlasting righteousness*, and work out the salvation of his elect. This was abundantly revealed, this they steadfastly believed, and in the faith hereof "obtained a good report," or testimony from God himself that they "pleased him," inherited the promises, and were made partakers of life eternal; and further at present we need not inquire into their light and apprehensions, seeing they must be considered in our Exposition of the Epistle itself, which now way is making unto.

3. For the Jews, as divested of the privileges of their forefathers, we may consider them with reference unto two principal seasons;—first, From the time of the *actual exhibition* of the promised Seed, or the coming of the Messiah, to the time of the composition of their Mishnah and Talmuds that ensued thereon; secondly, From

thence unto this present day; and in both these seasons we may consider the *prevailing opinions* amongst them concerning the promised Messiah, his coming, and the work that he hath to do. That, towards the close of prophecy in the church of old, the hearts and spirits of men were intently fixed on a desire and expectation of the coming of the Messiah, the last of the prophets clearly testifies: Mal. iii. 1, "The Lord, whom ye are seeking, the Angel of the covenant, whom ye are desiring, shall come suddenly." As the time of his coming drew nigh, this expectation was increased and heightened; so that they continually looked out after him, as if he were to enter amongst them every moment. No sooner did any one make an appearance of something extraordinary, but instantly they were ready to say, "Is not this the Messiah?" This gave advantage unto sundry *seditious impostors*, as Theudas and Judas of Galilee, to deceive many of them unto their ruin. John the Baptist also they inquired about, John i. 19, 20; yea, and they had divulged such a report of their expectations, with the predictions and prophecies that they were built upon, that the whole world took notice of it, as hath been elsewhere manifested out of the best Roman historians. This was the state of the Judaical church not long before the destruction of the second temple. And so fixed were they in their resolutions that he was to come about that season, that during the last desolating siege of the city, they looked every day when he would come and save them.

4. But notwithstanding this earnest desire and expectation, they had utterly lost the light and faith of their forefathers about the nature, work, and office, of the promised Messiah; for, being grown carnal, and minding only things earthly and present, they utterly overlooked the spiritual genealogy of the Seed of the woman from the first promise, and, wresting all prophecies and predictions to their ambitious, covetous, corrupt inclinations and interests, they fancied him unto themselves as one that was to deliver them from all *outward trouble*, and to satisfy them with the glory and desirable things of this world, without respect to sin and the curse, or deliverance from them; and hence the Sadducees, who denied the immortality of the soul, and consequently all rewards and punishments in another world, yet no less desired and expected the coming of the Messiah than the Pharisees and their disciples. And the truth is, they had brought their principles unto a better consistency than the others had done; for if the promised Messiah was only to procure them the "good things" of this world, and that whilst they lived in it, it was in vain to look for another world to come, and the blessings thereof. To look for *eternal life*, and yet to confine the promise of the Seed to the things of this life only, there was neither ground nor reason; so that the Pharisees laid down the principle which the Sadducees

naturally drew their conclusion from. Some, in the meantime, among them, God's secret ones, as Simeon, Anna, Joseph, Zacharias, and Elisabeth, but especially the blessed Virgin, with many more, retained no doubt the ancient faith of their forefathers. But the body of the people, with their leaders, being either flagitiously wicked or superstitiously proud, fancied a Messiah suited unto their own lusts and desires,—such a one as we shall afterwards describe. And this prejudicate opinion of a terrene, outward, glorious kingdom, in and of this world, was that which, working in them a neglect of those spiritual and eternal purposes for which he was promised, hardened them to an utter rejection of the true Messiah when he came unto them.

5. That this was the ground on which they rejected the promised Messiah is evident from the story of the Gospel, and we shall further prove it upon them in our ensuing discourses. How they did that, and what was the end thereof, are well known. But after they had done this, and murdered the Prince of life, to justify themselves in their wickedness and unbelief, they still with all earnestness looked after such a Messiah as they had framed in their own imagination. And herein they grew more earnest and furious than ever: for they had not only their own false, preconceived opinion, strengthened by their carnal interests and desires of earthly things, to act and provoke them, but also their reputation of and pretence unto the love and favour of God to heighten them in their presumptions; because they could not retain the least sense of them, if it might be supposed that they had rejected the true Messiah, because in his way and work he answered not their expectation. For this is the course of pride and carnal wisdom, to pursue those miscarriages with violence wherein they have been wickedly engaged, and to lay hold on any pretence that may seem to justify them in what they have done. And on this account they exposed themselves as a prey unto every seducer who made the least appearance of being such a Messiah as they thought meet for them to receive. This at last cast them on a second shipwreck in the business of Bar-Cosba, who, pretending himself to be their Messiah, sent to deliver them from the Roman yoke, and to set up a kingdom amongst them, drew them all the world over into that sedition, outrage, and war, which ended in an almost universal extirpation of the whole nation from the face of the earth.

6. Now, because in the business of this Bar-Cosba they met with a sore disappointment, that turned the stream of their imaginations and expectations for a long season, it may not be amiss to give in our passage a brief account concerning him and the things which befell them in those days. Some of the Jews affirm that there were two of that name, both heads of sedition amongst them. One of

these they place under Domitian; and the other, who was his grandchild, under the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. So do the authors of Shalscheleth Hakkabala and of Tzemach David. But the stories of those times, with the condition of the Jews under Domitian, will allow no other place unto the former but in their own imaginations. The latter was well known in the world, and hath left himself a name, such as it is, in the writings of Christians and the histories of the Romans; for Hadrian the emperor, provoked by a seditious tumult and rebellion of the Jews in the second year of his reign, —which he suppressed by Martius Turbo, as Dio, Eusebius, and Orosius declare,—drove them from Jerusalem, and built a temple to Jupiter in the place where the old temple stood. This proved a great provocation to the Jews all the world over, yea, turned them into rage and madness; and they were in those days exceedingly prone unto tumults and uproars, as being poor and needy, not having as yet given themselves to scrape wealth together, the love whereof hath been the great means of keeping them in quietness in succeeding ages.

In this condition Bar-Cosba shows himself amongst them, pretending that he was their Messiah, as they confess in the Talmud. Tract. Sanhed. Dist. Chelek. He reigned, they say, three years and a half,—a fatal period of time; and אמר לרבנן אנא משיח,—"he said to the rabbins, 'I am the Messiah.'" Immediately, one of their famous masters, whose memory they yet much reverence, Rabbi Akiba, became his armour-bearer, and so far his trumpeter also as to proclaim him to be their King Messiah; for this is their way, when they get a *false Messiah*, they have also a *false prophet* to usher him in, or to set him off unto the people. And this Akiba, as Maimonides informs us, חכם גדול היה ומחכמי המשנה, "was a great, wise man, and one of the wise men of the Mishnah," as his sayings in it manifest; so that all the wise men of that generation followed him, and took this Bar-Cosba for their King and Messiah. And he first applied unto him the prophecy of Balaam, Num. xxiv. 17, concerning the Star that should come out of Jacob; whereon they changed his name, and called him Bar-Cochba, or "The son of the Star;" or, as some say, that was his name at first, whence the blind rabbin took occasion to apply that prediction unto him. Concerning him, also, they interpreted the prophecy of the Shiloh, and that also in Haggai about the shaking of the heavens and the earth, as they acknowledge in the Talmud, in the place fore-cited. This man, therefore, a magician and a bloody murderer, by the common advice and counsel of their doctors and wise men, they gathered unto in multitudes, and embraced as their Deliverer. So soon as he had got strength and power, he set himself to the work which they expected from their Messiah, namely, to conquer the Romans, and to extir-

pate the Christians; which last, as Justin Martyr, who lived near those days, informs us, he endeavoured with all cruelty. In the pursuit of this design he continued for three years and a half, obstinately managing a bloody war against the Romans, until the impostor himself was slain, their great rabbi taken and tortured to death with iron cards, and such a devastation made of the whole nation as that to this day they could never gather together in great numbers in any place of the world.

Maimonides tells us of this Bar-Cosba, whom they all received for their Messiah, לא שאלו ממנו חכמים לא אות ולא מופת,—"that the wise men required of him neither sign nor wonder;" that is, no miracle: but others of them report that "he caused fire to come out of his mouth," with other diabolical delusions, fit to deceive a poor, blinded, credulous multitude. And the opinion of Maimonides, that they look for no miracles from the Messiah, seems to be vented on purpose to obviate the plea of the Christians from the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus, and is contrary unto the constant persuasion of most of their masters, and his own judgment declared in other places. And the Targum itself on Hab. iii. 18 hath these words, בכן על נסיא ופורקנא דתעבד למשיחך;—"Because of the miraculous signs and redemption that thou shalt work for" (or "by") "thy Messiah." So they call the miracles wrought at their coming out of Egypt, נסים or נסיא. See Hos. ii. 15, Targum. And on this ground do they studiously and wickedly endeavour to stain, by any means, the glory of the miracles of the Lord Jesus. But the end of this impostor,—who probably was intended in these words of our Saviour, John v. 43, "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive,"—hath proved the shame and reproach of their hopes and expectations unto all generations.

7. From this time forward, the remaining Jews, with their posterity, utterly rejected the faith of their father Abraham, and of the rest of their progenitors, who thereby "obtained a good report" and "this testimony, that they pleased God." A Messiah that had been promised unto Adam, the common father of us all; one that should be a *spiritual Redeemer* from sin and misery; a Goël or Redeemer from death and wrath; a Peace-maker between God and man; one that should work out everlasting salvation, the great blessing wherein all the nations of the earth were to have an interest; a spiritual and eternal Prophet, Priest, and King, God and man in one person,—they neither looked for any more, nor desired. A *temporal king* and deliverer, promised unto themselves alone, to give them ease, dominion, wealth, and power, they would now have, or none at all. They would not think it thankworthy towards God himself, to send them a Messiah to deliver them from sin. And in their expectations of such a one, after they had been well wearied with many frustrations, they were, as

was said, in their adherence unto Bar-Cosba almost extirpated from the face of the earth; only God in his providence, who hath yet another work to accomplish towards them, hath preserved them a remnant unto his glory.

8. In this condition, some of them began to deny that there was any Messiah to be expected or looked for. This opinion is ascribed in the Talmud unto Rabbi Hillel, lib. Sanhed. cap. Chelek. This was not that Hillel whom they call הזקן, "The elder," the famous master of traditions, who with Shammai lived under the second temple, but another, of whom some say that he was the son of Gamaliel, others, more probably, that he lived a long time after those days. But whenever he lived, they say of him, הלל אומר אין להם משיח לישראל שכבר אכלוהו בימי חזקיהו;—"Rabbi Hillel said, 'A Messiah shall not be given unto Israel; for they enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.'" This was a fruit of their applying that prophecy of Isaiah, chap. ix. 6, 7, unto Hezekiah; for if he was intended therein, he was unquestionably the *only Messiah.* But it doth not appear that this opinion was much followed; for a great dispute arose amongst them whether Hillel were not to be esteemed an apostate, and to have lost his interest in the world to come by this opinion. Those who, following Maimonides, make the article of the coming of the Messiah one of the fundamentals of the law, are greatly offended at him; but he is more gently treated by Joseph Albo, Sepher Ikharim, Orat. i., on the account that this article is not fundamental, but only one branch of the great root of rewards and punishments. Abarbanel goes another way to excuse him; but generally they all condemn his opinion. In this persuasion, then, that a Messiah is promised, and shall come, they all continue; but whereas, as was before observed, they have utterly rejected the faith and light of the church of old, they have in their Talmuds, and for ages ensuing their composition, coined so many foolish imaginations concerning him, his person, work, office, kingdom, life, continuance, and succession, as are endless to recount. But yet, that the reader may in them consider the woful condition of men rejected of God, cast out of his covenant, and bereaved of his Spirit, and withal of how little use the letter of the Old Testament is unto the vain minds of men wholly destitute of divine illumination and grace; and also learn what is that present persuasion of the Jews which they prefer before the faith of their forefathers, and what they conceive of that Messiah for whose sake they reject Him in whom alone there is salvation; I shall give an account of the most important heads of their opinions and conjectures about him, as also of the principal occasions of their being hardened in their impenitency and unbelief.

9. Our apostle tells us, 1 Tim. iii. 16, that "without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified

in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." All things which concern the Messiah, his person, office, and work, are exceedingly mysterious, as containing the principal effect of the eternal wisdom and goodness of God, and the sacred depths of the counsel of his will. Hence the things spoken of him in the Old Testament are, unto carnal reason, full of seeming inconsistencies. As, for instance, it is promised of him that he should be the seed of the woman, Gen. iii. 15; of the seed of Abraham, chap. xxii. 18; and of the posterity of David: and yet that his name should be, "The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace," Isa. ix. 6; and of him it is said, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," Ps. xlv. 6; and we are told that he is "The LORD our righteousness," Jer. xxiii. 6; that he is "The LORD of hosts," Zech. ii. 8. Moreover, it is declared that he shall sit upon his throne for ever, and reign, whilst his enemies are made his footstool, Isa. ix. 7, Ps. ii. 6–8, xlv. 6, 7, cx. 1: and yet that he shall be cut off, Dan. ix. 26; that he shall be pierced in his hands and feet, Ps. xxii. 16; slain by the sword of God, Zech. xiii. 7; and that in his death he shall have his grave made among the wicked and with the rich, Isa. liii. 9. Also, that he shall come with great glory, and with the clouds of heaven, Dan. vii. 13, 14; and that he shall come lowly, riding on an ass, and on a colt the foal of an ass, Zech. ix. 9: that the soul of the Lord was well pleased with him, and always delighted in him, Isa. xlii. 1; and yet that it pleased him to bruise him and put him to grief, chap. liii. 10; to forsake him, Ps. xxii. 1: that he was to be a king and a priest upon his throne, Zech. vi. 13; and yet these things were inconsistent, the kingdom being annexed unto the family of David, and the priesthood to the posterity of Aaron, by divine constitution: that he should be honoured and worshipped of all nations, Ps. xlv. 12, lxxii. 10, 11, 15; and yet that he should be rejected and despised, as one altogether undesirable, Isa. liii. 3: that he should stand and feed (or rule) in the name and majesty of God, Micah v. 4; and yet complain, "I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men, and despised of the people," Ps. xxii. 6. All which, with sundry others of the like nature concerning his office and work, are clearly reconciled in the New Testament, and their concurrence in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ openly and fully declared.

10. At the time of his coming, the Jews were generally as ignorant of these things as Nicodemus was of regeneration,—they knew not how they might be; and therefore, whenever our Saviour intimated unto them his divine nature, they were filled with rage and madness, John viii. 58, 59. They would stone him, because, being a man, he declared himself to be God, chap. x. 30–33; and yet, when he proved it to them that the Messiah was to be so, inasmuch

as that being David's son, yet "David in Spirit called him Lord," they were confounded, not being "able to answer him a word," Matt. xxii. 41–46. When he told them that "the Son of man," the Messiah, must be "lifted up," that is, in his death on the cross, they objected unto him out of the law that "Christ abideth for ever," John xii. 34; and they knew not how to reconcile these things. Hence some of his *own disciples* thought he could not be the Messiah when they saw that he died, Luke xxiv. 20, 21; and the best of them seemed to have expected an outward, temporal kingdom. But of all these difficulties, as was said, and seeming inconsistencies, there is a blessed reconciliation revealed in the gospel, and an application made of them to the person of the Lord Jesus, the office he bare, and the work that he accomplished. This the Jews refusing by unbelief, they have invented many fond and lewd imaginations to free themselves from these difficulties and entanglements. Some things they deny to be spoken concerning the Messiah, some things they wrest and pervert to their own apprehensions, and somewhat they allow and look for that is truly promised.

11. First, For his person and the things spoken concerning it, they apply thereunto the principal engine which they have invented for their relief; for whereas the Scripture hath declared unto us such a Messiah as should have the natures of God and man in one person, which person should in the nature of man suffer, and die, and rise, for spiritual ends and purposes, they have rejected the divine nature of this person, and split that which remaineth into *two persons;* to the one whereof they assign one part of his work, as to sorrow, suffer, and die; to the other another part, namely, to conquer, rule, and reign, according unto their carnal apprehensions of these things. They have, I say, feigned two Messiahs, between whom they have distributed the whole work of him that is promised, according unto their understanding of it; and one of these is to come, as they say, before the other, to prepare his way for him.

The first they call Messiah Ben Joseph, because he is to be of the tribe of Ephraim; the other, Messiah Ben David, of whom afterwards. Both of them are mentioned together in the Targum on Cant. iv. 5, תרין פקיריך דעתידין למיפרקיך משיח בן דוד ומשיח בן אפרים; —"Thy two deliverers which shall deliver thee, Messiah the son of David, and Messiah the son of Ephraim, are like to Moses and Aaron." The same words are repeated again, chap. vii. 3. And in those places alone, in the whole series of Targums, is there any mention of this fictitious Messiah; the author of that paraphrase on the Canticles being Josephus Cæcus, who lived after the finishing of the Talmuds, whereof he maketh mention. In other parts of the Targum he appeareth not; but in the Talmud he is frequently brought on the stage. So Tractat. De Festo Tabernacul. Distinct. Hachalil

Chamesha: "It is a tradition of our masters, that the holy, blessed God shall say unto Messiah the son of David, who shall redeem us, (let him do it suddenly, in our days!) 'Ask somewhat of me, and I will give it thee,' as Ps. ii.; and when he shall hear that Messiah the son of Joseph is slain, he shall say before the Lord, 'Lord of the world, I only ask life of thee:" for it seems that he shall be much terrified with the death of Ben Joseph. Unto this [latter] Messiah they assign all things that are dolorous (and include suffering in them which they call חבלי משיח), that are in the Scripture assigned to the Messiah, especially that prophecy, Zech. xii. 10, "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced." And hereby they sufficiently discover the occasion of the whole figment to have been that before intimated, namely, a necessity of an evasion from those testimonies of Scripture and ancient traditions which assign sorrows and sufferings unto the Messiah, which they will not allow to belong unto the son of David.

12. A brief account may be given of what it is that they now ascribe unto this Messiah, and what it is that they expect from him. The whole of his story depends on that of one Armillus, against whom he shall fall in battle, whose legend we must therefore also touch upon; and this is given us at large in ספר אבקת רוכל, in the "Seventh Sign of the Coming of the Messiah," and with some variation in ספר זרבבל, or "The Colloquy between Zerubbabel and Michael the archangel." A fable it is of no small antiquity; for we have mention of him not only in the later Targums on the Hagiographa, but in that of Jonathan also on the prophet Isaiah, chap. xi. 4: ובממלל ספותיה יהי מתיא ארמילוס רשיעא;—"And by the sword of his mouth he shall slay the wicked Armillus." And yet this invention is not older than the Talmud, however it came into that Targum, which, for the main of it, was certainly written long before. The mother of this Armillus is, they say, to be a "statue of stone at Rome," wrought into the similitude of a beautiful woman. This, saith the Dialogue of Zerubbabel, is the wife of Belial; and Armillus, that shall be born of her, is to be the head of all idolatry: ארמילוס בן אבן שיש שבבית חתורף של לצים;—"Armillus, the son of the stone, which is in the house of filth of the scorners" (that is, the churches of the Christians), "shall be the tenth king that shall afflict Israel."

The author of Abkath Rochel gives us somewhat another account of his nativity: "The people of all nations," saith he, "allured with the beauty of the image, shall come to Rome, and commit fornication with it, from whose uncleanness at length Armillus shall be born." The same author, after a description of his stature and bigness, (for he shall be twelve cubits high, and as broad as he is long!) with his hair, eyes, and whole complexion, gives us also an account of his actions and proceedings. First, therefore, he shall give him-

self out to the מנין, "heretics" (that is, Christians) to be their Messiah, who gave them their law, saying unto them, אני משיח אני אלהיכם,—"I am Messiah, I am your God;" and they shall presently embrace him, and give him their הפלות, or "prayer-books," acknowledging him to be the author of them. After this, by the help of the Edomites (Romans), he shall conquer many nations, until, coming unto the Jews, he shall require of them to receive him as their Messiah and the author of their law. But these good Jews shall with one consent oppose him, under the conduct of Messiah Ben Joseph, and of Nehemiah the son of Husiel, says one; of Menachem the son of Ammiel, says another. And in this war shall Messiah Ben Joseph be slain, as it is written, Zech. xii. 10.

13. I shall stay a little by the way, to unriddle this enigmatical fable, it having not been by any attempted. The name Armillus some suppose to be formed of ἐρημόλαος, "a waster of the people;" for such they intend he shall be. But the truth is, as Broughton first observed, and sundry others have assented unto him, it is no other than Romulus, with the usual Chaldee formation by Aleph. For whereas he contends that it should be read Romulus, and not Armillus or Armilus, there is no necessity for it; for the coiners of the fable might either ignorantly mistake the name, as is usual with these masters, or on purpose obscure it, that it might not at first view be known by the Christians, of whom they were afraid. And by Romulus, who was the first founder of the city and empire, they intend a prince of Rome, and such they declare their Armillus to be. And the whole story of him is compounded out of some prophetical passages and expressions in the Revelation of St John, or is feigned by themselves from the event of things, mixing their own conceits with the opinions of some Christians concerning Antichrist; for they plainly say that this Armillus is called by the Christians, אנטיכרישטוס, "Antichristus." *Image-worship* in the Revelation, as in the Old Testament, is expressed by the name of "fornication;" and Rome, because of her abounding therein, is called "The mother of harlots." Hence the image at Rome in the church is become the mother of Armillus, and that by the people of all nations committing fornication with it; which is the rise assigned unto antichristian power in the Revelation. This, then, is that which, in their way, they aim at,—the *worship of images* in churches, begun and promoted at Rome, furthered by the consent of the nations, shall bring forth that *Roman power* which shall seek to destroy the Israel of God.

And I am the rather inclined unto this conjecture, because I find that they are some of them not utter strangers unto the book of the Revelation, as those of them who are cabbalistical have a great desire to be inquiring into things mystical, which they under-

stand not, which they wrest and corrupt unto their own imaginations. Besides, it may be they are pleased with that description that is in it of the New Jerusalem; which some Judaizing Christians of old wrested unto a restoration of the earthly city of Jerusalem, and the renewed observation of the law of Moses. Thus the author of the Questions and Answers published by Brenius, quest. 26, inquires how Christians interpret these words of the Revelation, chap. xiii. 18, "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six:" to which he adds, "I have heard of none who hath clearly interpreted this place; but I can give a good interpretation of it." It is very likely he had considered it; though possibly his interpretation, which he was not pleased to declare, was little worth. And the visions of Rabbi Joshua about the heavenly paradise, with the gates of it made of precious stones, wherein are mixed many fables, not unlike those about Mohammed's entrance into heaven, in the Koran, were originally taken from the allegorical description given us of the New Jerusalem in that book, and abused to their superstitions. And from the same fountain it is that they have got a great tradition among them that they shall not be delivered until Rome be destroyed; for understanding Rome by Babylon in that prophecy, they apply that unto themselves which is foretold upon its destruction concerning the church of Christ. So Rabbi in צרור המור, or "Bundle of Myrrh," a commentary on the law, says more than once, בחרבן רומא מיד תהוה גאולתנו;—"Upon the destruction of Rome, our redemption shall ensue out of hand." And it is by many observed that an alteration is made in the later editions of the commentary of David Kimchi on Obad. i., in these words, ומה שאמרו נביאים בחרבן אדום באחרית הימים על רומי אמרו כמו שפי' בישעיה בפרשת קרבו גוים לשמוע כי כשתחרב רומי תהיה גאולת ישראל;—"That which the prophets spake concerning the destruction of Edom in the latter days, they spake it of Rome, as I have expounded it on that of Isaiah, 'Draw nigh, ye nations, to hear' (chap. xxxiv. 1); for when Rome shall be destroyed, then shall be the redemption of Israel;" but the name of Rome is left out in the later editions, though it abide in that of Robert Stephens, which he published on the minor Prophets. Sayings also unto the same purpose are cited out of Rabbi Bechai in Cad Hakkemach, Rabbi Solomon on Lev. vi., and sundry others.

14. And this will yet further appear, if we consider the account they give concerning the original and first building of Rome itself. Mention is made of it in the Talmud. Tract. Sanhed., and more largely declared in Midrash Rabba Cantic. Canticor., cap. i. 6, as it is from thence reported by Buxtorf in his Lexicon Talmud. Rad. רום. And their words are to this purpose: "Rabbi Levi said, that on

the day that Solomon was married unto the daughter of Pharaoh, Michael the great prince descended from heaven, and fixed a reed in the sea, so as that mud and dirt might on all sides be gathered unto it; and this place afterwards becoming a wood, was that place where Rome was afterwards built. For at the time that Jeroboam the son of Nebat made the two golden calves, there were two small houses built at Rome, which presently fell down; and being again set up, immediately they fell down again. But there was then present an old man, whose name was אבא קלון, Abba Kolon, who said unto them, 'Unless you bring water hither out of the river of Euphrates, and mix it with this clay, and build the houses therewith, they will never stand.' They said therefore unto him, 'And who shall bring it unto us?' He answered that he would. He went, therefore, and took on him the habit of one that carries wine to sell, and so went from one city unto another, from one country unto another, until he came at length unto Euphrates. When he came thither, he took water out of the river; which when he had brought unto them, they mixed it with their clay, and therewith built up the houses, which stood firm and stable. From that time it was a proverb amongst men, 'Every city or province where there is not Abba Kolon deserves not the name of a city or province, or of a metropolitical city.' And they called that place Rome, Babylon." And the gloss adds, "This is the place where Rome, that afflicteth Israel, was built." Cartwright, in his Mellificium Hebraicum, lib. i. cap. ix., reporting this story out of Buxtorf, adds, "Haud dubitandum videtur, eos sub isto verborum involucro Romam tanquam alteram Babylonem perstringere voluisse, quod nimirum quæ prius a Babyloniis, eadem atque etiam graviora postea a Romanis passi fuerint. Quin et Romanam idololatriam in eo perstringi arbitror, quod eodem die quo Jeroboamus filius Nebat vitulos aureos constituit, Romæ (i.e., in loco ubi postea condita est Roma) duo tuguria ædificata esse dicunt." So he, who alone hath conjectured at the intendment of this enigmatical story, and that to good purpose; I shall therefore make it more fully to appear. Rome they have learned to call Babylon out of the Revelation, as was declared; and thence conclude that upon the destruction of Rome they shall be delivered. Two things were eminent in Babylon;—first, that it was itself the beginning of all false worship and idolatry in the world, and therein the "mother of harlots;" the other, that God made use of it to punish the idolatries of the Jews. Hence they say that Rome, this new Babylon, had its foundation when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, and that it began to be built when Jeroboam set up his calves; which they look upon as the first two fatal instances of the declension of Israel into false worship and idolatry. And hereby they intimate, partly that Rome should set up idolatry, as Solomon and Jeroboam did;

and partly, that God had then provided a new Babylon to punish and destroy them. The Abba Kolon is a monster whom no man hath as yet set [eyes] upon; but it is no other but Capitolium, as they will easily grant who know how usual it is with them strangely to metamorphose things and words; instances whereof I shall elsewhere give. Thence is the proverb they speak of, "No Abba Kolon (no Capitol, or temple of idolatry), no city;" the Capitol answering the tower of Babel, which was a temple of Belus. Neither is that proverb any thing but an allusion to that in the Roman history, "Capitolium est ubi quondam capite humano invento, responsum est eo loco caput rerum, summamque imperii fore," Tit. Liv. lib. v. And the tempering of the clay of Rome with the water of Euphrates, by the help of Abba Kolon, is nothing but an expression of the succession of Rome into the stead of Babylon, which was built on that river, by the means of the Capitol, that great seat of idolatry. Nor do they at all distinguish between the *present* idolatry of Rome and that of *old*. So that, although all things are confounded by them with monstrous fictions and expressions, which it may be they invented on purpose to obscure their intention, yet their aim in the whole is manifest.

But to return: for the remaining part of the story concerning this Armillus, I know not whether they have borrowed it from those of the Roman church, or these from them, but evident it is that they strive to impose the odium of Antichrist upon one another. The Papists say that Antichrist shall be a Jew of the tribe of Dan, and that he shall persuade the Jews that he is their Messiah; that by their help, and others joining with them, he shall conquer many nations, destroy Rome, slay Enoch and Elias, and afterwards be destroyed himself by fire from heaven, by the power of Christ. The Jews, that their Armillus shall be a Roman, born of idolatrous fornication; that he shall persuade the Roman Christians that he is the head of their religion and author of their prayer-books; that he shall conquer many nations, fight against Jerusalem, slay Messiah Ben Joseph, and afterwards be consumed with fire from heaven, through the power of Ben David. To whether party the glory of this invention is to be assigned I am uncertain; the story, for the substance of it, is the same on both sides, only variously fitted unto their several interests.

15. And this shall be the end of Messiah Ben Joseph or Ephraim: Armillus having received a defeat by Nehemiah Ben Husiel, יקבון כל חילי אומות העולם לעמק החרוץ, "He shall gather the forces of all the nations of the world into the valley of decision," וילחם עם ישראל, "and they shall fight with Israel;" ויהרגו ממנו חילי חילים וינגפו מישראל מעט ויהרג משיח די; "and they shall slay of them" (of Armillus his army) "heaps" (or "multitudes") "on heaps; and they

shall smite a few of Israel, and they shall slay the Messiah of the Lord;" ובאין מלאכים השרת ונוטלין אתו ומטמינים אתו עם אבות העולם, "and the ministering angels shall come, and, perfuming his body, shall lay it up with the ancient fathers;" where it is to be kept many days without putrefaction, as Hector's body was (in Homer) after he was slain by Achilles. And it is not unlikely but that they may allude somewhat to the prophecy of the two witnesses, Rev. xi., who were to be slain, and afterwards called up to heaven. Thus do they at their pleasure dispose of this creature of their own; for having framed him themselves, he is their own, to do with him what they will, alive and dead. But that which is the poison and sting of this fable is, that the death of this fictitious Messiah must amongst them bear all that is spoken in the Scripture or continued by tradition concerning the humiliation, suffering, and death of the true Messiah of the Lord.

16. We need not stay long in the removal of this mormo out of our way. Should they invent twenty other Messiahs, as they have done this,—and on the same grounds and with as good authority they may,—the case would still be the same. Who gave them power to substitute themselves in the place of God,—to give new promises, to appoint new Saviours, and to invent new ways of deliverance? The Scripture is utterly silent of any such person, nor have they any ante-Talmudical tradition concerning him; and what their masters have invented in the Talmuds is of no more authority than what they coin every day themselves. The truth is, this whole story of Armillus and Ben Joseph is a Talmudical romance, the one the giant, the other the knight. But these fictions "seria ducunt." Poor creatures are hardened by them unto their eternal destruction. But is the world bound to believe what every one whom they are pleased to call Rabbi can imagine, though never so contrary to the principles of that religion which themselves pretend to own and profess? So indeed some of them say, that if their masters teach the right hand to be the left, yea, heaven to be hell, yet their authority is not to be questioned; and, as I remember, others say some such things of the pope. But God, I hope, of his goodness, will not suffer poor mankind to be always so deluded. All the promises of God, all the prophecies from the foundation of the world, concern only one Messiah, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and of the family of David; all the faith of the church of old, as we have proved, respected that one only: and who will lay any weight upon what is spoken, foretold, or promised concerning him, if the Jews have power to invent another at their pleasure?

17. Again; their masters have not only dealt dishonestly and blasphemously, but foolishly also, in this matter, in that they have not suited their own creature unto the end for which they have made

him. The end, as was showed before, why they advanced this imagination, was to give countenance unto what is spoken in the Scriptures, or retained by themselves in tradition, concerning the sufferings of the Messiah; and it is somewhat strange to me, that having raised up this Ben Joseph, they did not use him worse than they have done, but by a little foolish pity have spoiled their own whole design. They have a tradition among themselves, that the Messiah must *bear a third part of all the afflictions or persecutions that ever were or shall be in the world;* and what proportion doth a man's being slain in battle, where his army is victorious (which is all the hardship this Ben Joseph is to meet withal), bear unto the afflictions which befall the church in every age? And for the Scripture, it is mere lost labour to compare the death of this warrior with what is delivered therein concerning the sufferings of the Messiah. Every one not judicially blinded must needs see that there is no affinity between them.

The 53d chapter of Isaiah is acknowledged by their Targum, and sundry of the principal masters of their faith, to be a prophecy concerning him; and we shall afterwards undeniably prove it so to be. Now, the person there spoken of is one whom the Jews are to reject and despise, whom God is to afflict and bruise, by causing the sins of the whole church to meet upon him,—one who by his sufferings is to fulfil the pleasure of the Lord, making his soul an offering for sin, justifying the elect, and conquering Satan by his death. This fictitious Messiah is to be honoured of all the Jews, to raise armies, to fight a battle, and therein, after the manner of other men, to be slain; so that a story was never worse told, nor to less purpose. No other use can be made of it, that I know of, but only to consider in it the blindness of poor obstinate sinners, given up unto hardness of heart and a spirit of folly, for the rejection of him whom God sealed, anointed, and sent to be the Saviour of the world. Leaving them, therefore, in the embraces of this cloud, we may consider the other expected Messiah, whom they call Ben David, in whom principally they place their confidence.

18. The endless fables of the Jews about their Messiah, as they have been in part discovered by others, so I design not here at large to recount them. The chief masters of them in the Talmud are full of disputes and contradictions about him, and those of after ages succeed them in their uncertainties. Such will the conceptions of all men be, when they take up fancies and opinions of their own in matters of divine revelation. But some things there are wherein they all generally agree, and those relating unto his person, work, and office, which it shall suffice to give an account of, as answering our present design:—First, Therefore, they contend that he shall be a *mere man;* and there is nothing that they strive to avoid more than the testimonies of Scripture which show that the promised

Messiah was to be God and man in one person, as hath been already evidenced. They contend also that he shall be born *after the manner of all men,*—not of a virgin, but of a married woman, begotten by her husband. About the *place* of his birth they are not fully agreed; for although they all acknowledge the prophecy of Micah about Bethlehem to relate unto him, chap. v. 2, yet knowing that town now to have been desolate for many generations, and waste without inhabitant (which would seem to prove that he is come already), they contend that it is said he shall be born at Bethlehem because he is to spring of David, who was born there, for of the tribe of Judah and family of David he must proceed; although they have neither distinction of tribes nor succession of families left in the world amongst them. To relieve themselves from that difficulty, they feign that he shall restore unto them all their genealogies. About the *time* of his coming they are wofully perplexed, as we shall see afterwards. But many tokens they have of it when it doth come; for they heap up, out of some allegorical passages in the Scripture, such stupendous prodigies as never were nor shall be in the world. One of the principal of them is the sounding of the great trumpet, which all Israel shall hear, and the world tremble at, from Isa. xxvii. 13. The finding of the ark and sacred fire (which things were talked of in the late rumours about them) are indeed a part of their creed in this matter. His office, when he comes, is to be a *king;* which he shall be anointed unto by them when they are gathered together. And the work he is to do, is in *war* to fight with Armillus, Gog and Magog, to conquer the Edomites and Ishmaelites,—that is, the Romish Christians and Turks or Saracens,—and in so doing, to erect a glorious kingdom at Jerusalem. In *peace,* he is to rule righteously, not only over Israel, but also all the nations of the world, if they have any difference amongst them, shall refer all unto his determination and umpirage. In *religion,* he shall build the third temple, mentioned by Ezekiel, restore the sacrifices, and cause the law of Moses to be most strictly observed. But, that which is the head of all, he shall free the Jews from their captivity; restore them to their own land; make princes and lords of them all; giving them the wealth of all nations, either conquered by him or brought voluntarily unto him; feast them on Behemoth, Zis, and the wine of paradise: so that they shall see want and poverty no more!

This is the substance of their persuasion concerning his coming, person, office, and work. When he shall come; whether he shall live always, or die at a hundred years old; whether he shall have children, and if he have, whether they shall succeed him in his throne; whether all the Jews that are dead shall rise at his coming and their Galgal, or rolling in the earth from all parts of the world

into the land of Canaan, shall then happen or no; whether the general resurrection shall not succeed immediately upon his reign, or at least within forty years after, or how long it will be to the end of the world,—they are not at all agreed. But this, as hath been declared, is the substance of their persuasion and expectation:—That he shall be a mere man, and that the deliverance which he shall effect shall be by mighty wars, wherein the Jews shall be always victorious; and that in the dominion and rule which they shall have over all nations, the third temple shall be built, the law of Moses be observed by him and them, and the Noachical precepts be imposed on all others. As for any *spiritual salvation* from sin and the curse of the law, of justification and righteousness by him, or the procurement of grace and glory, they utterly reject all thoughts about them.

19. With these opinions many of them have mixed prodigious fancies, rendering their estate under their Messiah in this world not much inferior unto that which Mohammed hath promised unto his followers in another; and some of them, on the other hand, endeavour to pare off what superfluities they can spare, and to render their folly as plausible as they are able. Wherefore, that it may appear what is the utmost height of their conceptions in this matter, and that which the most contemplative persons amongst them fix upon, I shall subjoin a description of him and his kingdom in the words of Maimonides, one of the wisest and soberest persons that hath been amongst them since their last fatal dispersion. This man, therefore, in his exposition of the 10th chapter of Tractat. Sanhed., observing the fond and frivolous imaginations of their Talmudical masters about the Messiah, gives many rules and instructions about the right understanding of their sayings, to free them from open impieties and contradictions; and hereunto he subjoins, as he supposeth, the true notion of the Messiah and his kingdom, in the ensuing words: "As to the days of the Messiah, they are the time when the kingdom shall be restored unto Israel, and they shall return unto Palestine. And this king shall be potent, the metropolis of whose kingdom shall be Zion; and his name shall be famous unto the uttermost parts of the earth. He shall be greater and richer than Solomon; and with him the nations shall make peace, and yield him obedience, because of his justice and the miracles that he shall perform. If any one shall rise against him, God shall give him up into his hand to be destroyed. All the Scripture declares his happiness, and the happiness we shall have by him. Howbeit, nothing in the nature of things shall be changed, only Israel shall have the kingdom; for so our wise men say expressly, there is no difference between these days and the days of the Messiah, but only the subduing of the nations under us." So,

indeed, says Rab. Samuel, and others of them: אין בין העולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שיעבוד מלכיות. He goes on, "In those days victuals shall be had at an easy rate, as if the earth brought forth cates and clothes." And afterwards, "The Messiah shall die, and his son, and his son's son, shall reign after him; but his kingdom shall endure long, and men shall live long in those days, so that some think his kingdom shall continue a thousand years. But the days of the Messiah are not so much to be desired that we may have store of corn and wealth, ride on horses, and drink wine with music, but for the society and conversation of good men, the knowledge and righteousness of the king, and that then, without wearisomeness, trouble, or constraint, the whole law of Moses shall be observed."

20. This is the sum of the creed of the most sober part of the Jews concerning the Messiah, whom they look and long for;—if any are so sober as to embrace it; for the same author tells us that there were very few so minded, it may be scarce another in an age besides himself: generally, they look after nothing but rule, dominion, wealth, and pleasure. But he and they all own him as a *temporal king*, a mighty warrior, subduing the nations unto the Jews,—a Furius Camillus, or an Alexander, or a Cæsar. Of redemption from sin, death, and hell, of pardon of sin, justification, and righteousness, of eternal salvation by him, they know, they believe nothing. Maimonides thinks, indeed, that his kingdom shall long continue; not like Manasseh of late, who supposeth that it might not abide above forty years, and those immediately preceding the day of judgment.

21. It is sufficiently evident that this opinion and persuasion of the Jews, which is catholic unto them, and hath been so ever since they rejected the true Messiah, contains an absolute renunciation of the faith of the church of old, and an utter rejection of all the ends for which the Messiah was promised. I shall not, therefore, enter here upon a particular refutation of it; for it will occur in our ensuing discourses. Neither is this the person about whom we contend with them, nor have we any concernment in him. When he comes, let them make their best of him; we have already received the Captain of our salvation. What also they plead for themselves, as the ground of their obstinacy in refusing the true Messiah, must afterwards be particularly discussed. At present, therefore, I shall only reflect on those depraved habits of their minds, which, in concurrence with occasions and temptations suited unto them, have seduced them into these low, carnal, and earthly imaginations about the promised Seed, his person, office, and work that he was to perform.

22. In things, therefore, of this kind, *ignorance of their miser-*

able condition by nature, both as to sin and wrath, justly claims the first place; for although, as was by instances before manifested, the evidence of truth and power of traditions amongst them have prevailed with some to avow the notion of the sin of Adam, and the corruption of our nature thereby, yet indeed there is not any of them that have a true sense and conviction of their *natural condition*, and the misery that doth attend it. The Messiah, as we have proved at large, was first promised to relieve mankind from that state whereinto they were cast by the apostasy of Adam, the common root and parent of them all. Such as are men's apprehensions of that condition, such also will be their thoughts concerning the Messiah who was promised to be a deliverer from it. They who know themselves cast out of the favour of God thereby, made obnoxious unto his eternal displeasure, and disenabled to do any thing that shall please him, as being cast into a state of *universal enmity* against him, must needs look on the Messiah promised, in the grace, goodness, and wisdom of God, for a Saviour and Deliverer, to be one that must, by suitable ways and means, free them from sin and wrath, procure for them the favour of God, enable them to serve him again unto acceptation, and so bring them at length unto their *chief end*,—the everlasting enjoyment of him. As these things answer one another, and are on both sides fully revealed in the Scripture, so the church of old, who had a due apprehension of their own condition, looked for such a Messiah as God had promised. *Ignorance*, therefore, of this condition is no small cause of the present Judaical misbelief. Whatever may be the estate of other men, about which they do not much trouble themselves, for their part they are children of Abraham, exempted from the common condition of mankind by the privilege of their nativity; or, at least, they are relieved by their circumcision, by the pain whereof they make sufficient satisfaction for any ill they bring with them into this world! That they are "dead in trespasses and sins," standing in need to be "born again;" that they are "by nature children of wrath," obnoxious unto the curse of God; that the sin of our first parents is imputed unto them, or if it be, that it was of any such demerit as Christians teach,—they believe not. Upon the matter, they know no misery but what consists in poverty, captivity, and want of rule and dominion. And what should a *spiritual Redeemer* do unto these men? What beauty or comeliness can he have in him, for which, of them, he should be desired? What reason can they see why they should understand the promises concerning him in such a way and sense as that they should not be concerned in them? And this blindness had in a great measure possessed their minds at the first promulgation of the gospel. See John viii. 33, 34, ix. 40, 41. And therefore our

apostle, in his Epistle unto the Romans, wherein he deals both with Jews and Gentiles, before he declares the propitiation that was made, with the justification that was to be obtained by the blood of Christ, convinceth them all of their miserable, lost condition on the account of sin, *original* and *actual*, chap. i.–iii. Until, therefore, this pride, self-fulness, and ignorance of themselves, be taken from them and rooted out of their hearts, all promises of a *spiritual Redeemer* must needs be unsavoury unto them. They stand in no need of him, and why should they desire him? An *earthly king* that would give them liberty, wealth, ease, and dominion, they would gladly embrace, and have long in vain looked for.

23. Secondly, *Ignorance of the righteousness of God*, both as to what he requireth, that a man may be justified before him, and of his judgment concerning the desert of sin, hath the same effect upon them, Rom. x. 3, 4. The great end for which the Messiah was promised, as we have in part declared, and shall afterwards further evince, was to make *atonement for sin*, and to bring in *everlasting righteousness*, Dan. ix. 24. A righteousness was to be brought in that might answer the justice of God and abide its trial. Of what nature this righteousness must be the Scripture declares, and that as well in the revelation it makes of the holiness of God, Ps. v. 4, 5, Josh. xxiv. 19, Hab. i. 13, as of the purity and severity of his law, Deut. xxxiii. 2, xxvii. 26, and the absolute perfection of his justice in the execution of it, Ps. l. 21. A universal, spotless *innocency*, and a constant, unerring *obedience* in all things, and that in the highest degree of perfection, are required, to find acceptation with this holy and righteous God. Of the nature and necessity of this righteousness the Jews are ignorant and regardless. They and their masters were so of old, Matt. v. 20. An outside, partial, hypocritical observance of the law of Moses they suppose will serve their turns. See Rom. ix. 31. And, indeed, there is not any thing that more openly discovers the miserable blindness of the present Jews, than the consideration of what they insist upon as their righteousness before God. The faith and obedience of their forefathers, the privilege of circumcision, some outward observances of Mosaical precepts, with anxious, scrupulous abstinences, self-macerations in fasts, with prayers by tale and number, Sabbath rests from outward labour, with the like bodily exercises, are the sum of what they plead for themselves. Now, if these things, which are absolutely in their own power, will compose and make up a righteousness acceptable unto God, cover all the sins whereof they know themselves to be guilty, to what end should they look for a Redeemer to bring in everlasting righteousness, or to make atonement for sin? Why should they look out in this case for relief, seeing they have enough at home to serve their turns? Let them that are "weary and heavy laden"

seek after such a Deliverer; they have no need of him or his salvation. According, therefore, as this building of self-righteousness went on and prospered amongst them, faith in the Messiah, as to the true ends for which he was promised, decayed every day more and more, until at length it was utterly lost: for, as our apostle tells them, if righteousness were by the law, the promise of the Messiah was to no purpose; and if the law made things perfect, the bringing in of another priesthood and sacrifice was altogether needless.

24. So is it also with them as to their apprehension of the *judgment of God concerning the desert of sin.* The natural notion hereof the vilest hypocrites amongst them were sometimes perplexed withal. See Isa. xxxiii. 14; Mic. vi. 6, 7. But the generality of them have long endeavoured, by prejudicate imaginations, to cast out the true and real sense of it. That God is angry at sin, that in some cases an atonement is needful, they will not deny; but so low and carnal are their thoughts of his severity, that they think any thing may serve the turn to appease his wrath or to satisfy his justice, especially towards them whom alone he loves. Their afflictions and persecutions, the death of their children, and their own death, especially if it be by a *painful distemper*, they suppose to make a sufficient propitiation for all their sins; such mean and unworthy thoughts have they of the majesty, holiness, and terror of the Lord. Of late, also, lest there should be a failure on any account, they have found out an invention to give their sins unto the devil, by the *sacrifice of a cock;* the manner whereof is at large described by Buxtorf, in his Synagoga Judaica. And this also hath no small influence on their minds to pervert them from the faith of their forefathers. Let the Messiah provide well for them in this world, and they will look well enough unto themselves as to that which is to come.

25. And hence ariseth also their *ignorance of the whole nature, use, and end of the Mosaical law*, which also contributes much to the producing of the same effect upon them. To what end the law was given, whereunto it served, what was the nature and proper use of its institutions, shall be declared as occasion is offered in the exposition of the Epistle itself. For the present, it may suffice unto our purpose to consider their apprehensions of it, and what influence they have into their misbelief. In general, they look on the law and their observance of it as the only means of obtaining righteousness and making an atonement with God. So they did of old, Rom. ix. 32. In the observation of its precepts they place all their righteousness before God; and by its sacrifices they look for atonement of all their sins. That the law was not given, that the sacrifices were not appointed, for these ends, that the fathers of old never attended unto them *absolutely* with any such intention, shall

be afterwards declared. In the meantime, it is evident that this persuasion corrupts their minds as to their thoughts about the Messiah; for if righteousness may be obtained and atonement made without him, to what end serves the promise concerning him? But having thus taken from him the whole office and work whereunto of God he was designed, that he might not be thought altogether useless, they have cut out for him the work and employment before mentioned; for looking on righteousness and atonement, with the consequent of them, eternal salvation, as the proper effects of the law, they thought meet to leave unto their Messiah the work of procuring unto them liberty, wealth, and dominion, which they found by experience that the law was not able to do. But had their eyes indeed been opened in the knowledge of God and themselves, they would have found the law no less insufficient to procure by itself a heavenly than an earthly kingdom for them; and against their prejudicate obstinacy in this matter doth the apostle principally oppose himself in his Epistle unto them.

26. But here, by the way, some may possibly inquire how the Jews, if they look for atonement and the remission of sins by the sacrifices of the law, can now expect to have their sins pardoned, without which they cannot be eternally saved, seeing they are confessedly destitute of all *legal* sacrifices whatever? Have they found out some other way, or do they utterly give over seeking after salvation? This very question being put unto one of them, he answers that they now obtain the pardon of their sins by *repentance and amendment of life*, according to the promises made in the prophets unto that purpose, as Ezek. xviii. 21; and concludes, "Quamvis jam nulla sint sacrificia, quæ media erant ad tanto facilius impetrandam remissionem peccatorum, eadem tamen per pœnitentiam ac resipiscentiam declinando a viis malis impetratur;"—"Although there are now no sacrifices, which were a means the more easily to obtain the forgiveness of sins, yet it may be obtained by repentance and a departure from ways of evil." This is their hope, which, like that of the hypocrite, "is as the giving up of the ghost;" for,—(1.) It is true, *repentance and amendment of life* are required in them who seek after the forgiveness of their sins, and many promises are made unto them; but is this *all* that God required that sin might be forgiven? They are sufficient, indeed, in their own way and place, but are they so absolutely also? Did not God moreover appoint and require that they should make use of sacrifices to make atonement for sins, without which they should not be done away? See Lev. xvi. And, (2.) What is the meaning of that plea, "That by sacrifices, indeed, remission of sins might more easily be obtained, but obtained it may be without them"? Doth this "more easily" respect God, or man? If they say it respects God, I

desire to know, if he can pardon sin without sacrifices, why he cannot do it as *easily* as with them? or what is he *eased* of by sacrifices? If it respect themselves, as indeed it doth, then it may be inquired what it is that they shall be eased of in the obtaining of the pardon of sins by the use of sacrifices, when that is again restored unto them? This can be of nothing but of that which they are now forced to make use of for that end and purpose. And what is that? Why, repentance and amendment of life! If, then, they had their sacrifices, these might be spared, or at least much in them abated which at present is necessary. This, then, it seems, was the end why God instituted sacrifices, namely, that these Jews might obtain pardon of sin without either repentance or amendment! and this is that which they love as their souls, namely, that they may live in their sins, and be acquitted of all danger by sacrifices and outward services. (3.) Atonement for sin is expressly necessary, or all the institutions of sacrifices for that end, of old, were vain and ludicrous. At the same time, when sacrifices were in use, repentance was also required, and therefore not a cause or means for the same end in the same kind with them. And therefore, notwithstanding their pretence of repentance, no Jew, upon his own principles, can now, in the total cessation of all sacrifices, obtain either pardon of sin here or salvation hereafter. But to proceed.

27. Their corrupt, *carnal affections* have, moreover, greatly contributed, and yet do so, unto their obstinacy in their unbelief. Hence have they coined their self-pleasing imaginations about the Messiah, and the work that he hath to do. That he should be a king and reign gloriously, that his dominion should be over all the world and endure throughout all generations, was promised concerning him from the beginning. They think much, therefore, what advantage this kingdom may afford unto them, comparing it in their minds with those other empires which they see in the world. Wealth, ease, liberty, dominion, or a share in power and rule, are the things that please their carnal minds, and evidently fill them with envy and wrath against them by whom they are possessed. These things they look after and hope for, as the only things that are desirable,—the only pledges, indeed, of the favour of God. No persons on the earth have their thoughts more fixed on them than they. As their oppressions increase, so do their desires after liberty and rule; and they have learned nothing by their poverty but to grow in a greedy fierceness after riches. And when they would at any time set out the care of God towards their nation, they declare that "such a one in such a place was worth so many thousand crowns, or drove such a trade, or was in such favour as that he rode in a coach or chariot;" as may be seen in the address of Manasseh unto the English. This covetousness and ambition, with revengeful thoughts against their

oppressors, possessing their minds, makes them desire, hope, and believe, that the kingdom of their Messiah shall be of this world, and that therein their enjoyments shall be as large as whatever now their fancy can reach unto. And so perfectly are they under the power of these lusts and earthly desires in this matter, that, take away their hopes of satisfying of them in the good things of this world, they will on very easy terms bid adieu unto their Messiah, or grant that he is already come. But whilst they are obstinately fixed in the expectation of them, to tell them of a spiritual and heavenly kingdom, wherein the poorest and most persecuted person on the earth may have as good an interest and enjoy as much benefit by it as the greatest monarch in the world, and you do but cast away your words unto the wind.

28. Secondly, Since the propagation of the gospel, and its success in the world, *envy against the Gentile believers*, another corrupt lust, hath exceedingly perverted their minds in their notions about the Messiah. And this they are filled withal upon a twofold account:—

First, upon that of the *spiritual privileges* which they saw claimed by them. That the Gentiles, or nations of the earth distinct from Israel, should be fellow-heirs in the promise with the posterity of Abraham according unto the flesh, was declared by all the prophets of old. But yet, as we have showed, this was done by them in that obscure manner, in comparison of the revelation made of it in the gospel, that the grace and counsel of God therein is called a "mystery" hid from the ages that went before. Wherefore, when this design of the love and wisdom of God was brought to light, it filled the Jews, who had lost the faith of it, with envy and wrath. See Acts xiii. 45–47, 50, xxii. 21–23; 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16. The stories of all ages from thence unto this day testify the same; nor do they yet stick to express these *corrupt affections* as occasion is offered. And this envy, being greatly predominant in them, hardens them in their imagination of such a Messiah as by whom the Gentiles may receive no benefit but what may accrue unto them by becoming their servants. They cannot endure to hear unto this day that the Gentiles should be equal sharers with themselves in the promise of the Messiah. They would have him unto themselves alone, or not at all. And this keeps up their desires and expectations of such a one as they have fancied for their own ends and purposes.

29. Again, their *envy* against the Gentiles is greatly increased and excited by the *oppressions and sufferings* from them which they undergo. This adds hatred and desire of revenge unto it; which render it impotent and unruly. I speak not now of their present and past sufferings from Christians, which in many places have been unrighteous and inhuman, and so undoubtedly a great occasion of hardening them in their obstinacy; but of their *long-*

continued oppressions under the power of the Gentiles in general. Having been greatly harassed and wasted by them in most ages, and having a Deliverer promised unto them, they are strongly inclined to fancy such a deliverance as, being peculiarly theirs, should enable them to avenge themselves on their old enemies and oppressors. And this they think must be done, not by a heavenly, spiritual king, ruling in the things concerning religion and the worship of God, but by one that, having a mighty kingdom in this world, shall by force and power subdue their enemies under them. Such a one, therefore, they desire and look for. And how hard it is for them to depose these thoughts, unless they are freed by the grace of God from the carnal affections mentioned, is not hard to guess. And these are some of those especial occasions whereby the Jews, through their own blindness, are hardened in their unbelief and disobedience unto the gospel, whereunto others of the like kind may be added.

30. This is the faith and expectation of the *present Jews* all the world over concerning the Messiah in whom they place their confidence: A mere man he is to be, a king over the Jews at Jerusalem, who shall conquer many nations; and so give peace, prosperity, and plenty, unto all the Israelites in their own land. But what great matter is in all this? Have not other men done as much and more for their citizens and people? Can they fancy that their Messiah should be more victorious or successful than Alexander? They dare not hope it. At a disputation before the pope and cardinals at Rome, which they have recorded in Shebet Jehudah, they openly professed that they never expected so great glory by their Messiah as that which they saw them attended withal; and Manasseh confesseth that it is no great or extraordinary matter which they looked for by him, De Resur., lib. ii. cap. xxi. "Non est," saith he, "tantum miraculum si Messias veniat subjugatum regna sibi et imperia multa, cum non raro accidisse videamus ut humiles aliqui abjectique ad regna et imperia pervenerint, terrarumque multarum domini fierent;"—"It is no such miracle that the Messiah should come and subdue many kingdoms and empires unto himself, seeing it often falls out that men of mean and abject condition do come unto kingdoms and empires, and are made lords of many countries." It is so indeed. They say nothing of him but what may be paralleled in the stories of the nations of the world, especially considering the shortness of his reign, which they begin to think shall not be above forty years.

31. But do these things answer the promise made concerning him from the foundation of the world? Is this the meaning of the promise given unto Adam? Was this the end of the call and separation of Abraham? this the intendment of the promise made unto

him, that "in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed?" Is this only the importance of it, that towards the end of the world many of them shall be *conquered?* Was this the intent of the oath made unto David, and of the "sure mercies" confirmed unto him and his thereby? Do all the promises in the Prophets, set out in words glorious and magnificent, end in a warrior inferior it may be unto many of those whose destruction they prophesied of? Or is not this rather a way to expose the whole Old Testament unto scorn and reproach, as making the promises thereof not to extend unto that glory which in others the penmen of it despised, or at least to regard only things of the same nature with them? Was this the expectation of the fathers of old? Is this that which they desired, prayed for, longed for, esteeming all the glory of their present enjoyments as nothing in comparison of it? What is in this Messiah, that he should be the hope and "desire of all nations?" Did God set him forth as the great effect of his love, grace, goodness, and faithfulness towards them, and then bring forth a military king, in whose exploits they were not all to be concerned? Was the church in travail for so many generations to bring forth this fighter? Had they no eye of old unto spiritual and eternal things in the promise of the Messiah? Of late, indeed, Josephus Albo tells us that the doctrine of the coming of the Messiah is not fundamental; and Hillel of old maintained that Hezekiah was the Messiah. "He should have been so," saith another, "had he composed a song unto God." "Bar-Cosba," a seditious necromancer, "is the Messiah," says R. Akiba. "He shall come, it may be, immediately before the resurrection," saith Manasseh. But do these thoughts suit the faith, hope, prayers, and expectations of the church of old? do they answer any one *promise* of God concerning him? No man, not utterly unacquainted with the Scripture, can give the least countenance unto such imaginations.

32. What, all this while, is become of the work everywhere in the Scripture assigned unto the Messiah? Whom is that cast off unto? Who shall break the serpent's head? Who shall take away the curse that entered on sin? Who shall be a blessing unto all nations? To whom shall the Gentiles be gathered, to be saved by him? Who shall be a priest after the order of Melchizedek? Who shall have a body prepared him, to offer instead of the sacrifices of the law? Who shall have his hands and feet pierced in his suffering, and his vesture parted by lot? Who shall make his soul an offering for sin? Who shall be bruised, grieved, and afflicted by God himself, because he shall bear the iniquities of his people? Who shall make atonement for transgressors, and bring in everlasting righteousness? Who shall for ever make intercession for transgressors? And who shall sit at the right hand of God in his rule over the whole world? All these things, and sundry others of the like kind, are openly and

frequently promised concerning the true Messiah, whereof not any of them is to be accomplished in or by him whom they look for. But these men indeed take a way to destroy all religion, and to turn the whole Bible into a story of earthly things, without either life, spirit, or heavenly mystery in it.

33. It is acknowledged that there are many promises of mercy and glory unto the church in the days of the Messiah, expressed in words whose first, literal sense represents things outward and temporal. And there is a threefold interpretation of them contended for:—The first is that of the Jews, who would have them all understood according unto their *literal importance*, without the allowance of any figure or allegory in them. But nothing can be more vain than this imagination, nor do they make use of it but where they suppose that it will serve their present design; for whereas the wisest of them do grant, that in the days of the Messiah the nature of things shall not be changed, but only their use, many of these promises, in their first, literal sense, import a full and direct alteration in the heavens and earth, and all things contained in them. So Isa. xi. 6–8, lions, bears, leopards, cockatrices, asps, calves, and young children, are said all to live, feed, and play together: and chap. lx. 7, it is said that the flocks of Kedar and the rams of Nebaioth should minister unto the church; verse 16, that she should suck the breast of kings: and verse 19, that the sun should no more give light by day; and yet, verse 20, that it should no more go down: chap. lxv. 17, that new heavens and a new earth shall be created, and that the old shall be remembered no more: that trees and fields shall rejoice and clap their hands for gladness: with other things innumerable in the same kind. Now, if they grant, as they must, unless they intend to expose all sacred truth to the scorn and contempt of atheists, that these expressions are figurative and allegorical, they must do the same in all other promises of earthly things, as of peace, plenty, victory, long life, dominion, wealth, and the like, being set out in the same kind of allegorical expressions. At least, they cannot make them, in the *strict literal sense* of the words, the object of their faith and expectation, unless they can by some infallible rule declare what is figuratively to be understood in them, what properly, or which promises are expressed allegorically, which not; and this they can never do The event, therefore, is the only infallible interpreter of the meaning of such prophetical predictions; whatever precedes that is but conjecture. Wherefore,—

34. Secondly, Some interpret all these *promises* and *prophecies spiritually*, without the least respect unto those outward, terrene things, which are made use of in figurative expressions only to shadow out those spiritual, heavenly, and eternal things which are intended in them. And indeed this way of interpretation, which

Calvin follows in all his commentaries, is attended with great probability of truth; for the main end and work for which the Messiah was promised being, as we have proved, spiritual and eternal, and whereas it is evident that many promises of things relating unto him and the condition of them that believe in him are allegorically expressed (it being the constant way of the Old Testament to shadow out spiritual and heavenly things by things earthly and carnal), this way of interpreting the promises seems to have great countenance given unto it, both from the nature of the things themselves, and the constant tenor of the prophetical style. According unto this rule of interpretation, all that is foretold in the Psalms and Prophets of the deliverance, rest, peace, glory, rule and dominion of the church; of the subjection and subserviency of nations, kingdoms, rulers, kings and queens, thereunto; intends only either the *kingdom of grace*, consisting in faith, love, holiness, righteousness, and peace in the Holy Ghost, with that spiritual beauty and glory which are in the worship of the gospel, or the *kingdom of heaven* itself, where lies our happiness and reward. And indeed this interpretation of the promises, as in respect of many of them it is evidently certain, true, and proper, they being so expounded in the gospel itself, so in respect of them all it is safe and satisfactory to the souls of believers; for they who are really made partakers of the spiritual good things of the Messiah, and are subjects of his spiritual kingdom, do find and acknowledge such liberty, rest, peace, and glory, those durable riches therein, as they are abundantly content withal, whatever their outward condition in this world may be. And unto this exposition, as to the main and prime intendment of the promises, the whole doctrine of the gospel gives countenance.

35. Thirdly, Some, acknowledging the kingdom of the Messiah to be heavenly and spiritual, and the promises generally to intend spiritual and heavenly glory and riches,—that is, grace and peace in Christ Jesus,—do yet suppose, moreover, that there is in many of them an intimation given of a blessed, quiet, peaceable, flourishing estate of the church, through the power of the Messiah, to be in this world. But this they do with these limitations:—(1.) That these promises were not made unto the Jews as they were the seed of Abraham according unto the flesh primarily and absolutely, but unto the church,—that is, the children of Abraham according unto the promise, heirs of his faith and blessing; that is, they are made unto all them who receive and believe in the promised Messiah, Jews and Gentiles, with whom, as we have proved, the privilege of the church and interest in the promises was to remain. (2.) That the accomplishment of these promises is reserved unto an *appointed time*,—when God shall have accomplished his work of severity on the apostate Jews, and of trial and patience towards the called Gentiles.

(3.) That upon the coming of that season, the Lord will, by one means or other, take off the veil from the eyes of the remnant of the Jews, and turn them from ungodliness unto the grace of the Messiah; after which, the Jews and Gentiles, being made one fold under the great Shepherd of our souls, shall enjoy rest and peace in this world. This they think to be intimated in many of the promises of the Old Testament which are brought over unto the use of the church, as yet unaccomplished, in the Book of the Revelation. And herein lies all the glory which the Jews can or may expect, and that only on such terms as yet they will not admit of. But these things must all of them be spoken unto at large, when we come to answer the objections which they take from them unto our faith in Jesus Christ.

36. That which, above all things, manifests the folly and irreligion of the imagination of the Jews about the person and work of the Messiah is the *event.* The *true Messiah* is long since come, hath accomplished the work assigned unto him, and made known the nature of the first and consequent promises, with the salvation that he was to effect;—no way answering the expectation of the Jews, but only in his genealogy according unto the flesh. And this is that which is the second supposition on which all the discourses and reasonings of the apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews are founded, and which, being absolutely destructive of *Judaical infidelity*, shall be fully confirmed in our ensuing dissertation.

EXERCITATION XII.

[SECOND DISSERTATION]—THE PROMISED MESSIAH LONG SINCE COME.

1. Second principle supposed by the apostle Paul in his discourses with the Hebrews: The promised Messiah was then come, and had done his work. 2. The first promise recorded בְּקִנְאָתֹו כֹּחַ—Promise with the limitation of time for his coming necessary. 3. First determination hereof made by Jacob, Gen. xlix. 8–10—The promise confined to Judah, afterwards to David; no more restrained. 4. Jews' self-contradicting exceptions to the words of Jacob's prophecy. 5. Interpretation of Rashi; 6, 7. Of Aben Ezra examined. 8, 9. Who meant by "Judah"—The tribe, not his person, proved. 10. "Sceptre" and "scribe," how continued in Judah—The same polity under various forms of government—How long they continued. 11. Did not depart on the conquest of Pompey, nor reign of Herod. 12. Continuance of the sanhedrim—The name סנהדרין, whence—Συνέδριον, the place and court of judges—Jews' etymology of the word. 13. Institution of that court, Num. xi. 16. 14. The orders of the court. 15. Place of their meeting—Λιθόστρωτος, גַּבְּתָא, John xix. 13. 16. Qualifications of the persons—Who excluded. 17. Their power. 18. Punishments inflicted by them. 19, 20. The lesser courts—Mistake of Hilary. 21. "Shiloh," who, and what the word signifies. 22. Judaical interpretation of עַד כִּי refuted. 23. Argument from the words. 24.

Rule granted unto Judah, proved by the context. 25. Consent of Targumists. 26. Use of the words. 27. Judaical evasions removed. 28. Rise and signification of the word "Shiloh." 29. Messiah intended thereby. 30. לֹא יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה opened and vindicated. 31. Consent of Targums, 32. Talmuds, and most learned rabbins. 33. Sceptre long since departed. 34. Story of Benjamin Tudelensis examined—Messiah long since come.

1. THE *second great principle* supposed by the apostle in all his discourses with the Hebrews, in his Epistle to them, and which he lays as the foundation of all his arguments, is, that the Messiah, whom we have proved to have been promised from the foundation of the world, was actually come, and had finished the work appointed for him, then when he wrote that Epistle. This the Jews pertinaciously deny unto this very day, and this denial is the centre wherein all the lies of their unbelief do meet; and hereupon, in a miserable, deplorable condition, do they continue crying for and expecting his coming who came long since, and was rejected by them. Now, this being the great difference between them and Christians, and that such a one as hath a certain influence into their eternal condition, as they have endeavoured to invent evasions from the force of the testimonies and arguments whereby our faith and profession are confirmed, so are we to use diligence in their vindication and establishment; which we hope to do unto the satisfaction of the sober and godly wise in our ensuing discourse.

2. The first great promise of the Messiah, at large insisted on before, declared only his coming, and the end of it in general. This promise was recorded בְּמְגִלַּת־סֵפֶר, Ps. xl. 8, or, as our apostle, Heb. x. 7, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου,—in the beginning, head, or first roll, of the book of God, namely, Gen. iii., as a stable foundation of all the rest that ensued; and it respected all the posterity of Adam, that they might have a refuge whereunto to repair in all their distresses. When the care of it, and respect unto it, and faith in it, were rejected by the world, εἴασε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν, Acts xiv. 16, God left it unto the ways of its own choosing, to shift for itself, and in his sovereign grace and pleasure renewed the promise unto Abraham, with a restriction and limitation of it unto his family, as that which was to be separated from the rest of mankind, and dedicated to the bringing forth of the Messiah in the appointed season, as we have declared. Upon the giving of that promise, with the call and separation of Abraham, whereon the church became in a special manner visible, there wanted nothing, to confirm the faith and fix the expectation of those that desired his coming, but only the determination of the time wherein he should so do.

And this was necessary upon a double account:—(1.) That those who were to live before his advent, or appearance in the flesh, might not only by faith see his person *afar off*, and be refreshed, as Cant.

ii. 8, but also behold his day, or the time limited and prefixed unto his coming, and rejoice therein; and that not only as Abraham, who knew that such a day should be, John viii. 56, but also as those who had a certain day so limited as that, by diligent inquiry, 1 Pet. i. 11, they might take some especial prospect of it. (2.) To guide them who were to live in the days of the accomplishment of the promise unto a more earnest expectation of him and desire after him; as Daniel had for the return of the people from the captivity, when he understood by books that the time limited for it was accomplished, Dan. ix. 2, 3. Accordingly it came to pass; for from hence it was that at that season when he was to be exhibited all men were in expectation of him, and prepared thereby to inquire after him, Luke iii. 15.

3. Now, this determination of time inquired after was first made by Jacob, Gen. xlix. 8–10, accompanied with a signal demonstration of one especial person from whom the Messiah was to proceed, even in the family of Jacob himself. Such another restriction also, and but one, ensued, when that privilege, which originally rested in Abraham and his family, and was afterwards restrained unto Judah and his posterity, was lastly confined unto David and his offspring, and ever after left at large unto any branch of that family. And this I mention by the way, to prevent any difficulties about his genealogy: for as, in the very first instance of the regal succession in the house of David, there was no respect had to the *primogeniture*, 1 Kings ii. 22, so there was no necessity that the Messiah should spring from the *reigning family*, although he did so, but only that he should be of the seed of David. For as, after the promise given unto Abraham, the Messiah might have sprung from any family whatever of his posterity by Isaac, until the limitation made by Jacob unto the person of Judah; and after that limitation might have done so from any family of his tribe or posterity, until the confinement of that privilege to the person of David; so no restriction or limitation being afterwards added, his production by any person of his posterity, whether in an alliance nearer to or farther from the *reigning line*, was all that was included in the promise. To return: the words of the place above quoted are, "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים;"—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver" (or "scribe") from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him the gathering of people." These last words are the seat of our argument, the

former, therefore, we shall no otherwise consider but as they give light and evidence to their interpretation.

4. The great masters among the Jews are exceedingly perplexed with this testimony, and have therefore invented endless ways for the enervating of it, openly and loudly contradicting one another almost about every word in the text. Some would evade the sense of it by interpreting שֵׁבֶט to be only "a rod," of correction, say some, of supportment, say others; and מְחֹקֵק, they would only have to be a scribe, such as they fancy their present rabbins to be. Some by יְהוּדָה understand the person of Judah, unto whom they ascribe I know not what pre-eminence, and not his family or tribe. Some would have עַד to be separated from כִּי, that follows, because of the accent Jethib, and to signify "for ever." Some by the שִׁילֹה would have David intended; some, Ahijah the prophet; some, the city Shiloh; and most know not what. יִקְהַת, some would have to be "destruction;" some, "instruction and obedience." And on every one of these cavils do they build various interpretations, and provide various evasions for themselves; all which we shall either obviate or remove out of the way in the ensuing discourse.

5. It were endless to consider all their several expositions; and useless, because they are fully confuted by one another; and whatever seems of importance in any of their exceptions will be fully answered in our exposition and vindication of the text and context. Only, to give the reader a specimen of their sentiments, I shall briefly consider the sense and exposition of one of them, and him of such reputation that he hath generally obtained the name of החכם, "The wise;" and this is R. A. B. Meir, Aben Ezra. And that we may the better see the perverseness of this man, and therein of his followers, I shall briefly give an account of the exposition of Rashi his companion in annotations on the Pentateuch, in their rabbinical Bibles. First, By שֵׁבֶט "sceptre," he understands "rule and government;" as he doth "scholars in the law" by מְחֹקֵק, from these words, מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו, "from between his feet," expressing, as he conceived, the posture of disciples. By "Judah" he understands the house of David, the ruling family amongst them, the authority whereof was preserved in the ראשי גליות, or "heads of the captivity," whilst they were in Babel. And on these words, עַד כִּי יָבֹא שִׁלֹה, waiving all the former trivial exceptions, he adds expressly, מלך המשיח שהמלוכה שלו וכן תרגמו אנקלוס ומדרש אגדה;—"'Until the Shiloh come,' that is, Messiah the King, to whom that kingdom belongs, as the words are interpreted by Onkelos in his Targum, and in Midrash Agadah." And יִקְהַת עַמִּים, he expounds, אסיפת העמים, "The collection" (or "gathering together") "of the people;" so agreeing with the Targum, and the truth in the most material passages of the text.

6. But Aben Ezra, as we observed, is otherwise minded, and in him we have an example of the wilful blindness of the residue of them, who will not endure the light of that conviction which is tendered unto them in this testimony. First, By "Shebet" he grants rule to be intended, or pre-eminence above others; being then somewhat more modest than their later masters. "This," saith he, "shall not depart from Judah עד שבא דוד,"—"until David come." And why David? שהוא תחלת מלכות יהודה;—"For he was the beginning of the kingdom of Judah." So that it seems the meaning of the words is, that "the sceptre shall not depart until the sceptre come;" that is, they should have rule until they had rule! for, as himself well observes, the kingdom of Judah began in David. But what sceptre had the house of Judah before? Four hundred years the people were ruled under judges, of which but one was of that tribe. At length a kingdom was set up in the house of Benjamin. Where was all this while the sceptre of Judah, if that was the space of time designed for its continuance? Two instances he gives hereof. First, כי דגל יהודה נוסע בראשונה;—"The standard of Judah marched first in the wilderness." גם אמר השם יהודה יעלה בתחלה;—"Again, God said, 'Judah shall go up first.'" But what was this to a sceptre and a lawgiver? The first belonged only unto the order of the tribes in the wilderness, whilst Moses was prince, of the tribe of Levi; and afterwards Joshua, of the tribe of Ephraim: nor was that privilege, if any it were, peculiar unto Judah, but common to the other tribes joined with him. The other was only an *occasional expedition*, wherein the especial concernment of Judah lay, which gave him no power nor sovereignty amongst his brethren. So that we have here no small instance how the wisest of their masters do befool themselves in seeking evasions from this testimony. Of the sense of the following words, abstracting from the design of the whole, he gives a tolerable account, "Nor a lawgiver from between his feet:" מחקק סופר שיחוק על ספר;—"Mechokek is a scribe, who engrosseth any thing on a roll or book;" וטעם מבין רגליו שכן דרך כל סופר להיות יושב בין רגלי הקצין,—"and that expression, 'From between his feet,' is taken from the common custom of such scribes to sit at or between the feet of the prince," namely, to record and enrol the laws of his kingdom; although the phrase of speech seems to incline to another sense, but about this we will not differ with him.

7. He next proceeds to the interpretation of the word שִׁילֹה, which before he applied unto David; and, to show the uncertainty and wanderings of all them who reject the true and only intendment of the Holy Ghost in this expression, he gives us the various opinions of his masters, not knowing himself what to adhere unto. יש אומרים;—"Some," he says, "there are who interpret it from the

Syriac, as if it were as much as שלו, 'unto him,' or 'cujus omnia.'" But this yields him no advantage. Sundry learned men suspect some such sense in the word or derivation of it, ה being put for ו; and the translation of the LXX., reading ᾧ ἀπόκειται, seems to have had respect thereunto. But then the Messiah is signally denoted, whose the kingdom was, whom the promises especially respected, and to whom the gathering of the people was to be. Some, he adds, derive it from שליל, which signifies the embryo in the womb; and in allusion hereunto, many interpret the word "his son," from שיל, which is as much as בן, from שליה, "the second birth," or certain membranes of the womb. And he adds afterwards, that שילה may be as much as בנו, ה being put for ו. But yet neither can he hence obtain any thing towards his design. Wherefore he proceeds, "Some expound it of the city Shiloh, and then they interpret יָבוֹא, 'shall come,' כמו בא השמש, as that, 'The sun cometh,' that is, sets, or goes down, Eccles. i. 5; that is, עד־כי יבא קץ שילה,—'Until the end of Shiloh come;' for so it is written, 'He rejected the tabernacle at Shiloh, and chose David his servant.'" But it is evident unto all who use the least attention unto these things how forced, indeed foolish, this exposition is, "Until Shiloh come,"—'that is, until the city Shiloh be deserted, or forsaken, or destroyed;' so that, "Until it come," signifies, "when it shall be no more!" The application of that word to the setting of the sun, וּבָא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, "And the sun goeth down," is clear from the nature of the thing itself, and from the preceding words, וְזָרַח הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, "The sun riseth;" but thence to draw it here to express the *destruction of a city*, in which sense it is never used, is a conceit purely rabbinical. Besides, we have showed already that sceptre and lawgiver could in no sense be said to abide with Judah until David came; for before his days that tribe had no especial interest in government at all. But this catching at relief from a word no way suited to contribute the least assistance in the case in hand, is a strong argument of a desperate sinking cause, which rather than men will forego, they will reach after helps from the shadow of the least twig that seems to be nigh unto them. I shall not contend with him about what he nextly asserts, namely, that this "until" doth not prove the ceasing of rule and government when the Shiloh comes. It is enough for us that it was not to cease before he came, as shall further be manifested in our ensuing explication and vindication of this prophecy. I have only by the way more particularly considered the evasions of this man, who is called, amongst the masters of the present Judaical profession "The wise," that the reader may know what thoughts to entertain concerning the expositions and objections of others of them who have not attained that reputation.

8. The *subject* here spoken of is "Judah," and that not as merely

declaring the person of the fourth son of Jacob, but the tribe and family that sprang and was to spring from him. So are the whole tribes everywhere called in Scripture by the name of him from whom they sprang, and that principally from the prophecy and blessing in this chapter, wherein the common stream of patriarchal blessing, hitherto running in one channel, is divided into twelve branches, each son of Jacob being constituted a distinct spring of benediction unto his posterity.

Now, that the tribe of Judah, and not his person, but only as from him the whole received its denomination, and as he is included therein, is intended in this prophecy, is evident; for,—(1.) The things mentioned in this great *patriarchal benediction* were such as should befall the posterity of his children, to whom he spake, בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים "in the latter days," or "in the end of the days," as were all the blessings of them that went before Jacob also. Now, that expression in general signally denotes the times of Messiah, as we shall afterwards declare, and as hath in part already been made manifest; and as it relates in particular unto any of the tribes, it denotes the whole continuance of their times until that season should be accomplished: so that it cannot be restrained unto the persons of any of them. (2.) Nothing that is spoken of any of the rest of the sons of Jacob belonged unto them *personally;* no, though it had its foundation in their persons, or in an allusion unto their personal actings. Thus the "dividing of Simeon and Levi in Jacob," and the "scattering of them in Israel," belonged not unto their persons, though what befell their posterity of that nature had a special eye unto their *personal miscarriage,* verses 5–7. Neither was any thing here spoken of Judah in any measure fulfilled in his person, who spent his days in Egypt, without any pre-eminence among his brethren, or rule with conquest and terror, like a lion, over others. It is then the family, tribe, or posterity of Judah, that by that name is here intended.

9. Now, this tribe of Judah may be considered either *absolutely* in itself, as it was in its separate stations and condition in the wilderness, without the mixture of any not of his posterity; or with respect unto that *accession* which was afterwards made unto it occasionally from the other tribes. And this was fourfold:—First, From the lot of Simeon falling within its lot in the first inheritance of the land, Josh. xix. 1; whence that tribe, though still keeping its distinct genealogy, was reckoned unto Judah, and became one people with them. Secondly, By the cleaving of the tribe of Benjamin, whose lot lay next unto it, and mixed with it in the very city of the kingdom, to the reigning house of David in the fatal division of the people, 1 Kings xii. 20, 21, 27; upon which both those tribes were afterward called by the name of "Judah," verse 20, and the people of both יְהוּדִים, "Judæi," or Jews. Thirdly, By the falling off of the tribe

of Levi unto it, with multitudes of other good men out of all the tribes of Israel, upon the idolatries and persecution of Jeroboam, 2 Chron. xi. 13–17; by which means that one tribe quickly became more numerous and potent than all the rest. Fourthly, By the mixture and addition of those great numbers which, out of all the tribes of Israel, joined themselves unto them upon their return from Babylon, and the restitution of the worship of God amongst them in its proper place. Now, it is Judah with all these accessions that is intended in this prophecy and benediction; yet so as that in many things,—as, namely, in the *production of the Messiah*,—the natural, genuine offspring of Judah was still to have the pre-eminence.

10. That which is foretold concerning this Judah is, that it should have שֵׁבֶט and מְחֹקֵק, a "sceptre" and "law-giver," or a writer of laws for others' observation. That rule, power, and government, are hereby intended shall be afterwards evinced. What time this should come to pass is not limited; only, after it did so, it was not to cease until the Shiloh came. The foundation of the execution, then, of this promise, in the erection of polity and government in that tribe, was not laid until about six hundred and twenty years after this time. So certain is that which we before observed, that this patriarchal benediction concerned not the persons of his sons and their then present condition, but that of their posterity in the latter days; and this was done when the kingdom was given to David, of the tribe of Judah. Neither is the *kind of government* or rule which should be erected in that tribe expressed in the words, only a rule and polity is promised unto it, or that they should be a people having the principle of rule or government in and among themselves. Whilst they continued such, the sceptre and scribe departed not from them; and this they did, as with great variety in the outward form of government, though the law and polity amongst them were still the same, so not without some intercision of rule, until the time specified was accomplished. And where the law and polity are still the same, accidental alterations in the modes and manner of governing make no essential change in the state of the people or nature of the government. Thus the first constitution or rule in that tribe was in a way of government absolutely *monarchical*. This being imprudently managed by Rehoboam, lost the ten tribes, who would never afterwards submit unto the regal family of Judah. Its retrieval, after an intercision made of it in the Babylonish captivity, was *ducal*, or by an honorary president, with a mixture both of aristocracy and of the power of the people. Upon the ceasing of these extraordinarily called rulers, the *aristocracy* in the sanhedrin prevailed; whereunto succeeded a *mixed monarchy* in the Asmonæans into their power and place; and their interest being ruined by intestine divisions, Herod by craft and external force intruded himself.

Neither did his usurpation make any essential change in the rule or polity of the nation, although in his own person he was a foreigner; for even during the turbulent government of the Herodians, with the interposition of the Roman arms, the nation, with that which constitutes a people, its laws and polity, was still continued, though the administration of superior rule was not always in the hands of Jews. In this state things continued amongst them until the destruction of the commonwealth by Vespasian, and of the city and temple by Titus; only, as a presage of the departure of sceptre and scribe, the power of judgment as to the lives of men was some years before taken from the sanhedrin, John xviii. 31.

11. By this fixation of rule in general in Judah, we are freed from any concernment in the disputes of learned men about the precise time of the departure foretold; and, indeed, if any thing be more intended in this prediction, but only that the tribe of Judah should continue in a national political state, with government in itself, it will be utterly impossible to determine exactly and precisely upon the accomplishment of this prophecy. Some would fix it on the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, during the time of Hyrcanus and Aristobulus the Asmonæans, not many years after which the Shiloh came,—which small remnant of time, as they suppose, impeacheth not the truth of the prediction,—for in that action of Pompey, Cicero declares the nation conquered: "Victa est, elocata, servata," Orat. pro Flacc. But if this might suffice for the departure of sceptre and scribe, much more might the former conquest by the Babylonians do so; which yet, by all men's consent, it did not. Besides, the nation was left free by Pompey unto its own laws and polity, as were many other nations subdued by him. Τῶν εἰλημμένων ἐθνῶν τὰ μὲν αὐτόνομα ἠφίει, says Appian, Bell. Mithrid. cap. cxiv.;—"He left some of the conquered nations free to their own rule and laws," among which were the Jews. Some fix the period in Herod, an Idumæan, a stranger to Judah, only a proselyte; on which account we have many contests, managed by Baronius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Bullinger, Montague, Pererius, A Lapide, Cappellus, Scultetus, Rivetus, Spanhemius, and others innumerable.

But granting Herod to have been an Idumæan, as he was undoubtedly by extract, and that nation not to have been incorporated into Judah upon the conquest made of it by Hyrcanus, only that he was in his own person a proselyte, why the sceptre should any more depart from Judah because of his reign, than it did in the days of the Asmonæans before him, who were of the tribe of Levi, I see no reason. The government and polity of the nation was that of the Jews, whoever usurped and enjoyed the place of supreme rule; as in the Roman empire the rule and government was that of the Romans, though Philip an Arabian, Maximinus a Thracian, and sundry others,

foreigners, were emperors amongst them. One would solve the difficulty of the Asmonæans and Herodians by affirming that the supreme power of the nation in their days was in the sanhedrin, the greatest number of the persons whereof it was constituted being always of the tribe of Judah, as the Talmudists constantly affirm. But neither are we concerned herein. The government, as hath been manifested, was still in and of the tribe of Judah, with the fore-mentioned accessions denominated from it, until the destruction of the country, city, and temple, by Vespasian and Titus; which is all that in the prediction is intended. And that was the precise season aimed at, especially if we suppose, as rationally we may, that עַד כִּי is to be repeated ἐκ κοινοῦ, and to respect the last clause of the prediction, "And to him the gathering of the nations;" which was accomplished signally before the final ruin of the church and state of the Jews, according as Christ himself foretold, Matt. xxiv. 14.

12. Now, because some fix the departure of the sceptre and lawgiver *unto the removal of the sanhedrin*, it may not be amiss to declare in our passage what that sanhedrin was, and what the power wherewith it was intrusted, and this briefly, because it is a subject that many learned men have laboured in. The name סנדרין or סנהדרין, "sanedrin" or "sanhedrin," is taken from the Greek, *συνέδριον*. Συνέδριον sometimes signifies the place where the senators meet,—the same with *βουλευτήριον*; as in Herodian, Συνῆλθον οὖν οὐκ εἰς τὸ συνήθει συνέδριον, ἀλλ' εἰς τοῦ Διὸς τὸ Καπιτωλίον·—"They assembled not in the accustomed council-house, but in the Capitol, the temple of Jupiter." But most frequently it is taken for "consessus judicum," an assembly of judges, a court made up of many assessors; whence the areopagum, that is, "the court of judges," is so called in Æschines. Σύνεδρος is an assessor in such a court; and σύνεδρος κύκλος is such an assembly of magistrates or princes as they call "corona considentium,"—such as the sanhedrin was. And this name of sanhedrin, though it be plainly a Greek word, a little corrupted, as is the manner of the Jews in their use of them, is frequently used in the Targum of the Hagiographa; which places are collected by Elias in Tishbi. Some of the Jewish masters would have it to be a word of their own language, whence they invent strange etymologies of it, which are some of them mentioned by Buxtorf. Lex. Tal. Col. 1513; [thus] in Aruch, [a manuscript,] they would have it derived from שונאי דורונות, "haters of gifts," not knowing, doubtless, that "doronoth" is a Greek, and no Hebrew word.

13. The first appointment of this court, the original of this "consessus judicum," is recorded Num. xi. 16, where, by God's order, seventy elders are called and designed to join with Moses in the rule of the people, and are instructed with gifts to fit them for that purpose. The continuance of this, with the institution of other

courts depending thereon, is enjoined the people, Deut. xvi. Some say the first seventy were of them who had been officers over the people in Egypt, and had suffered for them: "Whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people and officers over them,"—זְקֵנֵי הָעָם; πρεσβύτεροι and πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, in the New Testament, "elders and elders of the people." Others think these had been elders and officers of the people before in criminal and civil causes, but now were absolutely joined with Moses in all. These with him made up seventy-one; which was the constant number afterwards.

14. The principal things recorded concerning this court of elders or judges are,—First, Their *orders*, namely, that there was one that always presided amongst them, whom they called נשיא, "The prince," and מופלא, "The excellent," who supplied the place of Moses; and on his right hand sat he whom they called אב בית דין, "The father of the house of judgment," or consistory, who gathered the suffrages of the assessors; by whom stood two scribes, סופרי הדיינים, "scribes of judgment," one on the right hand of the prince, the other on his left, one whereof wrote down the sentences of them who condemned, the other them who absolved, the persons that were to be judged. There belonged also to the court two criers, and two who received the alms that were given by them who were absolved. Before them, at some distance, sat those wise men out of whom the number of the sanhedrin, when any died or were removed, was to be supplied.

15. Secondly, The *place of their meeting*, which usually and ordinarily was at Jerusalem, בלשכת הגזית, "in a chamber of hewed stones," whence the judges are sometimes called by them, חכמי גזית, "The wise men of the stone chamber;" although, it may be, no more is intended in that expression but that it was a magnific, stately place or building, such as usually are made of stones hewed and carved. And they tell us that this place was built nigh the temple, part of it being on the holy ground, and part on that which was profane and common: whence also it had two doors; one on the sacred side, by which the prince and the assessors entered; the other on the profane, by which criminal persons were brought in before them by their officers. So Talmud in Joma. And this some take to be the place where our Lord Christ was judged: John xix. 13, "He sat down in the judgment-seat, in a place that is called λιθόστρωτος," that is, לשכת הגזית, the place built and raised up with hewed or squared stones; for that λιθόστρωτος doth not signify merely the "pavement," as we translate it, or the floor of the place, the apostle manifests by adding that "in the Hebrew it is called Gabbatha, גבתא;" —in the Hebrew; for although the word have a Syriac termination, according to the corrupt pronunciation of the Hebrew in those days among the people, yet the original of it is Hebrew, and the Syriac

renders it here גְּפִיפְתָא, and reads not גַּבָּתָא. Now this signifies a high place, or a place built up on all sides and exalted; such as the Roman βήματα, or judgment-seats, were placed on. But this might be an alike place to the other; for I much question whether the Roman governor sat in judgment in the meeting-place of the sanhedrin.

16. Thirdly, The Jews treat much of the *qualifications* of the persons who were to be of the number of the assessors of this court. For, first, they were to be of the priests, Levites, or nobles of Israel; that is, principal men in the commonwealth. Yet none were admitted into their number merely on the account of their dignity or offices, not the king, not the high priest, unless they were chosen with respect unto their other qualifications;—for, secondly, they were to be בעלי קומה, "men of stature," and בעלי מראה, "men of countenance," or good appearance, to keep up, as they say, a reverence unto their office; and they were also to be בעלי חכמה, "men of wisdom," and בעלי זקנה, "men of age," according to the first institution, and this carried the common appellation, "Elders of the people." They add, in Dine Mamonoth, that they were to be בעלי כשפים, "men skilled in the art of incantations and charms, to find out such practices;" which the Talmudists thought good to add, to countenance themselves, many of whom were professed magicians. And, lastly, they were to be ידעין בשבעין לשון, "skilled in seventy tongues," that they might not need an interpreter; but fewer, I suppose, served their turn. They treat also in general that they ought to be men fearing God, hating covetousness, stout and courageous, to oppose kings and tyrants if need were.

From this number they exclude expressly persons over old, deformed, and eunuchs, whom they conclude to be cruel and unmerciful, as Claudian doth,—

> "Adde quod eunuchus nulla pietate movetur
> Nec generi natisve cavet; clementia cunctis
> In similes, animosque ligant consortia damni."

> "Mercy from eunuchs is removed away;
> No care of race or children doth them sway.
> This only renders men compassionate,
> When misery is known their common fate."

17. The *power* of this court was great, yea, supreme many times, in all things among the people, and at all times in most things of concernment. All great persons and weighty causes were judged by them. When a whole tribe offended, or a high priest, or a king of the house of David, by these were their causes heard and determined. They had power also to determine about lawful war. They had two sorts of war: מלחמה מצוה, "commanded war." Such they esteemed war against the nations of Canaan, against Amalek, against any nation that oppressed Israel in their own land; and this kind of war the king, at any time, of his own accord might engage in. And

they had מלחמה הרשות, "war permitted" only, as war for security and enlargement of territories; which could not be engaged in at any time but by consent and upon the judgment of this court. The enlargement of the city of Jerusalem, the reparation of the temple, and the constitutions of courts of judicature in other cities, belonged also unto them. In a word, they were to judge in all hard cases upon the law of God.

18. Their sentence extended to life and death; which last they had power to inflict four ways: ארבע מותות ומסרו בית דין, סקילה שרפה הרג וחנק;—"Four deaths (four kinds of death) were committed to the house of judgment,—to stone, to burn, to slay with the sword, and to strangle." These were they who, in the days of the restoration of the church by Ezra, by reason of the excellency of the persons (many of them being prophets and men divinely inspired), are usually called אנשי כנסת הגדולה, "The men of the great congregation." And the power of this court was continued, though not without some interruption and restraint, unto the time of the last destruction of the city by Titus.

19. Besides this greater court, they had also two lesser in other places,—one of twenty-three assessors, which might be erected in any city or town where there were a hundred and twenty families or more, but not less; and these also had power over all causes, *criminal and civil*, which happened within the precincts of their jurisdiction, and over all punishments, unto death itself.

Hilary on the second psalm tells us that "erat a Mose ante institutum in omni synagoga septuaginta esse doctores;"—"Moses had appointed that in every synagogue there should be seventy teachers." He well calls them "teachers," because that was part of their duty, to teach and make known the law of God in justice and judgment. And he adds, "Cujus doctrinæ Dominus in evangeliis meminit, dicens;"—"Whose teaching our Lord mentions in the gospel, saying, The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair;" so referring the direction there given by our Saviour to the judicial determinations of these judges, and not to their ordinary teachings or sermons to the people. But herein his mistake is evident, that he supposeth the number of *seventy* to have belonged to every synagogue, which was peculiar to the great court before described.

And besides this judicature of twenty-three in the greater towns, there were also in the lesser towns appointed a court of three assessors, who might judge and determine in many cases, about money, debts, and contracts, but had nothing to do in transgressions that were capital.

20. In this court's judging and determining according to the law of Moses consisted the rule and polity of the nation: and it is evident that they were continued amongst them until the coming of the Shiloh; for themselves constantly aver that the power of judg-

ing capitally was taken from the sanhedrin about forty years before the destruction of the second temple, though, I suppose, it will be found that their power was rather occasionally sometimes suspended by the Romans than absolutely taken away, until the final destruction of the city.

21. Unto this Judah, that we may return, upon the grant and during the continuance of this sceptre and law-writer, it is promised that the Shiloh should come, that is, the Messiah; and that unto him shall be the gathering of the people. So was the promise unto Abraham, namely, that in his seed all people, or all nations of the earth, should be blessed. שִׁילֹה, "Shiloh," is a word used only in this place; and it comes from שָׁלָה, "shalah," to "prosper," or "save:" so that the most probable denotation of the word is a prosperer, a deliverer, a saviour, as we shall afterwards more fully manifest. The promise of the continuance of sceptre and law-writer is, עַד כִּי־יָבֹא, until this Shiloh should be come.

22. The Jews, as was intimated before, lay a double exception to the sense and interpretation which we gave of the particles עַד כִּי, "until:"—First, that עַד signifies "for ever:" so that the meaning of the words is, that the sceptre and law-writer shall not depart from Judah "for ever;" the reason whereof is given in the next words, because "the Shiloh shall come," כִּי being often causal. But though עַד may sometimes signify as much as "for ever,"—though mostly it doth but "adhuc," "yet," or "as yet,"—yet it doth not, nor can so, when it is joined, as here, with כִּי, which limits the duration intimated by the subject-matter treated on, and sense of the ensuing words that they have respect unto. They except, again, that עַד is burdened with the accent Jethib, which distinguisheth the sense, and puts a stop upon it. But this they can give no instance in the confirmation of, especially when it hath Athnac immediately preceding it, as in this place it hath. Besides, שֵׁבֶט and מְחֹקֵק, "sceptre and law-writer," are long since actually departed from Judah, and, in their judgment, the Shiloh not yet come; which perfectly destroys the verity of the prediction.

23. Having taken this brief view of the words, we may draw our argument from them, which is this: The Messiah, according to this prediction, must come while the rule and government of Judah was continued, or before it was utterly removed or taken away; but they are long since departed and taken away,—they have been so at least ever since the destruction of the nation, city, and temple, by Titus: and therefore the Messiah is long since come; which was proposed unto confirmation. To manifest the uncontrollable evidence of this testimony, and our argument from it, there is no more necessary but that we demonstrate,—first, That by "sceptre" and "law-writer," *rule* and *government* are intended; secondly, That the

promised Shiloh is the *Messiah;* thirdly, That all *rule* and *national polity* were long since utterly taken away from Judah, even on the destruction of the city and temple. Now, the proof of the two former we shall take, first, from the text and context; secondly, from the confession of the ancient Jews themselves. The last, being matter of fact, must be evinced from story, and the state of things in the world from those days; whereon there will be no rising up against this testimony by any thing but that pertinacious obstinacy which the Jews are judicially given up unto.

24. The FIRST thing proposed, namely, that by "sceptre" and "law-giver" rule and government are intended, is evident, not only from the words themselves, which are plain and expressive, but from *the context* also, neither was it ever denied by any of the Jews until they found themselves necessitated thereunto by their corrupt interest. Amongst other things, the dying patriarch foretelling the erection of a rule and government amongst his posterity, whereas it might have been expected that of course it should have been fixed in Reuben, his first-born, according to the line of its descent from the foundation of the world, he deprives him of it, verse 4. Though he was, in the ordinary course of nature, יֶתֶר שְׂאֵת וְיֶתֶר עֹז, "the excellency of his dignity and the excellency of his strength," verse 3, yet saith he, אַל־תּוֹתַר, "Thou shalt not excel,"—'not preserve that excellency in thy posterity, nor have the pre-eminence of rule,' for the reason which he there expresseth. In like manner he passeth by the next in order, Simeon and Levi, taking from them all expectation of that privilege, by foretelling that they should be "divided in Jacob, and scattered in Israel," verse 7. Coming to Judah, there he fixeth the seat of rule, verse 8, "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise," alluding unto his name, יְהוּדָה אַתָּה יוֹדוּךָ אַחֶיךָ; 'thou shalt be exalted unto that rule amongst them, from the right whereunto the others fell by their transgression.' And this rule, saith he, shall consist, as all prosperous dominion doth, in two things:—First, In the regular obedience of those who *de jure* are subject unto it: "Thy father's children shall bow down before thee;"—'Thou shalt have the authority among and over the rest of my posterity.' Secondly, In the conquest of the enemies and adversaries of the dominion itself: "Thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; as a lion's whelp thou art gone up from the prey:" whereunto the words insisted on are subjoined, "The sceptre shall not depart,"—that is, 'the sceptre of rule amongst thy brethren, and prevalency against thine enemies, however it may be weakened or interrupted, shall not utterly depart or be removed'—"until Shiloh come." The context is clear and perspicuous. The Jews, as we shall see, only cavil at words and syllables; the reason of the Scripture and the coherence of the context they take no notice of.

25. Secondly, the Targumists have, with one consent, given us the same account of the sense and importance of these words; and some of them are acknowledged by the Jews, in Shebet Jehuda, to have been composed by divine inspiration, or assistance of the בת־קול, as they express it in their Talmuds. Thus Onkelos, the best of them, לא יעדי עביד שולטן מדבית יהודה;—"The ruler, lord, or prince," he that hath dominion, "shall not be taken from the house of Judah." And Jonathan, לא פסקין מלכין ושליטין מדבית יהודה;—"Kings and rulers shall not cease from the house of Judah." The same words are used by that called of Jerusalem. The authority of these paraphrases among the Jews is such, as that they dare not openly recede from them. And therefore Manasseh in his Conciliator, where he endeavours to enervate this testimony, passeth over these Targums in silence, as having nothing to oppose to their authority; which is a sufficient evidence that he saw the desperateness of the cause wherein he was engaged. Solomon and Bechai acknowledge rule and dominion to be intended in the words: but, according to the latter, they are not to be erected until the coming of the Messiah; which is no less expressly contrary to the Targum than to the text itself, affirming plainly that then it was to end, and not begin. Add hereunto, further, to manifest the consent of the ancient Jews unto this sense of the words, that in their Talmuds they affirm the lawgiver here mentioned to be the sanhedrin, whose power continued in Judah until the Shiloh came; whereof we have spoken before.

26. Unto these reasons and testimonies we may subjoin the use of the words themselves. שֵׁבֶט is originally and properly a "rod" or "staff;" all other significations of it are metaphorical. Among them the principal is that of "sceptre,"—an ensign of rule and government; nor is it absolutely used in any other sense, but in that very frequently: Ps. xlv. 7, שֵׁבֶט מִישֹׁר שֵׁבֶט מַלְכוּתֶךָ;—"A sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." Num. xxiv. 17, וָקָם שֵׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל;—"A sceptre shall arise out of Israel;" that is, a prince or a ruler. Targum, "Christ shall rule out of Israel." And this sense of the word is made more evident by its conjunction with מְחֹקֵק, a "lawgiver"—he that prescribes and writes laws with authority to be observed. Deut. xxxiii. 21, "In a portion מְחֹקֵק סָפוּן," "of the lawgiver hidden;" that is, Moses. "The great scribe," saith the Targum; for, as they suppose, the sepulchre of Moses was in the lot of Gad. "Mechokek," saith Aben Ezra; that is, השליט הגדול, "the great president" or "ruler." Ps. cviii. 9, "Judah, מְחֹקְקִי," "my lawgiver;" with allusion to this prediction of Jacob. Isa. xxxiii. 22, "The LORD is our judge, the LORD is מְחֹקְקֵנוּ," "our lawgiver." These two words, then, in conjunction do absolutely denote rule and dominion.

27. The later masters of the Jews, to avoid the force of this tes-

timony, have coined a new signification for these words. "Shebet," they say, is only a "rod of correction;" and "Mechokek" any scribe or teacher, which they would refer to the rabbins they have had in every generation. Some of them by "Shebet" understand a "staff of supportment," which they were to enjoy in the midst of their troubles. So I remember Manasseh Ben Israel, not long since, made it one of his reasons for their admission into England, that thereby this prophecy might receive somewhat of accomplishment by this countenance and encouragement in this land. But the most of them adhere to the former sense of the words. So they call the story of their calamities and sufferings שבט יהודה;—"The Rod of Judah." But this evasion is plainly and fully obviated in the former opening of the words, and confirmation of their genuine importance: for,—(1.) It is openly contrary to the whole context and scope of the place; (2.) To the meaning and constant use of the words themselves, especially as conjoined; (3.) To the Targums, and all old translations; (4.) To the Talmud, and all their own ancient masters; (5.) To the truth of the story, Judah having been long in a most flourishing and prosperous condition, without any such signal calamity as that which they would intimate to be intended in the words, namely, such as for sixteen hundred years they have now undergone; (6.) The supportment they have had hath not been national, nor afforded to Judah as a tribe or people, but hath consisted merely in the greatness and wealth of a few individual persons scattered up and down the world, neither themselves nor any else knowing unto what tribe they did belong; and, (7.) This hath been in things no way relating to the worship of God, or their church-state, or their spiritual good; (8.) Their scribes were not formerly of the tribe of Judah, and their later rabbins wholly of an uncertain extraction. So that this pretence proves nothing but the misery of their present state and condition, wherein they seek a refuge for their infidelity in vanity and falsehood.

28. Our SECOND inquiry is concerning the *subject* of the promise under consideration, which is the "Shiloh;" whereby we say the promised Seed is intended. About the derivation and precise signification of the word we have no need to contend. Most learned men look upon it as derived from שָׁלָה, to be "quiet, safe, happy, prosperous;" whence also is שַׁלְוָה, Ps. cxxii. 7, "safety, peace, prosperity, abundance." Hence "Shiloh," says Mercer, "sonat tranquillum, prosperum, pacatum, felicem, augustum, victorem, cui omnia prospere succedunt,"—"signifies one quiet, prosperous, peaceable, happy, honourable, a conqueror, to whom all things succeed well and happily." To this etymology of the word agree Galatinus, Fagius, Melancthon, Pagninus, Drusius, Schindler, Buxtorfius, Amama, and generally all the most learned in the Hebrew tongue. The Vulgar Latin, ren-

dering the words, "qui mittendus est," "who is to be sent," as if it were from שָׁלַח, corrupts the sense, and gives advantage to the Jews to pervert the words, as both Raymundus and Galatinus observe. Neither is there any thing nearer the truth in the derivation of the word from שִׁלּוֹ, as though ה were put for ו, and שֶׁ for אֲשֶׁר, so making it as much as אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, "quæ ei," "which to him;" whereunto yet that ᾧ ἀπόκειται and the τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτοῦ of the Greeks, the former mentioned by Eusebius, the latter in the present copies, both by Justin Martyr, do relate or allude.

Others suppose שיל to signify "a son," from שליה, which denotes the "after-birth," or membrane wherein the child is wrapped in the womb. Thence שִׁילֹה, "Shiloh," should be the same with בְּנוֹ, "his son," ה being put for ו, which is not unusual, saith Kimchi. But Galatinus supposeth ה to be a feminine affix, denoting that the Messiah was to be the seed of the woman, or to be born of a virgin; neither is his conjecture absolutely to be rejected, although Mercer pronounces it to be against the rules of grammar, for we know they hold not always in things mysterious. He that would be further satisfied about the importance of the word, may consult Raymundus, Porchetus, and Galatinus, in their discourses against the Jews on this subject; Kimchi, Pagnin, Mercer, Schindler, Philip ab Aquino, and Buxtorf, in their lexicons; Munster, Fagius, Drusius, Grotius, in their annotations on the text; Helvicus, Rivet, Episcopius, Boetius, Hoornbeek, in their discourses from it. The weight of our argument lies not in the precise signification of the word. The Messiah it is who is intended in that expression,—

29. For, first, this is manifest from the context and words themselves. The promise of the Messiah was the foundation of that nation and people, the reason of the call of Abraham, and of the erection of a kingdom and a state in his posterity. This we have elsewhere demonstrated. This promise concerning him, and covenant in him, was always the chief matter and head of the patriarchal benedictions, when they blessed their children and posterity. Now, unless we grant *him* to be intended in this expression, there is no mention of him at all in this prophetical eulogy of Jacob. Besides, his posterity being now to be distributed into twelve distinct tribes or families, and each of them having his peculiar blessing appropriated unto him, wherein it is certain and confessed by all the Jews that this privilege of bringing forth the Messiah was henceforth empaled [*i. e.*, restricted] unto Judah, it must be done in this place, or there is no footstep of it in the Scripture; and it is very strange that Jacob, in reckoning up the privileges and advantages of Judah above his brethren, should omit the chief of them, from whence all the rest did flow. And the very tenor of the words manifests this intention. Fixing on that which was the fountain and end of all

blessing, on the promised Seed, he passeth over his elder children, and determines it on Judah, with the continuance of rule to the coming thereof.

30. Secondly, That which in the text is affirmed concerning this Shiloh makes it yet more evident who it is that is intended: וְלוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים;—"To him the gathering of the people." יִקְהַת: LXX., προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, "the expectation of the nations,"—that is, תִּקְוָה, from קָוָה, "to expect or look for." So the Vulgate, "expectatio gentium." Onkelos, וליה ישתמעון עממיא;—"And him shall the people obey," or "to him they shall hearken." Ben Uzziel, ובדיליה יתימסון עממיא;—"Because of him the people shall faint;" that is, cease their opposition, and submit unto him. Targum of Jerusalem, וליה עתידין דישתעבדון כל מלכותא דארעא;—"And to him shall all the kingdoms of the earth be subject." All to the same purpose. יִקְהַת, in construction, from יִקְהָה, is from יָקַהּ, "to hear, attend, obey." The word is but once more used in the Scripture, Prov. xxx. 17, where it is rendered "doctrine," or teaching given out with authority, and therefore to be obeyed: so that primarily it may seem to denote *obedience unto doctrine;* which because men gather themselves together to attend unto, it signifies also that gathering together; and so is rendered by Rashi, אסיפת, "the gathering together;" collection, or congregating; and also is it by others, who seem to look on קָוָה as its root, which signifies "to gather and collect," as well as "to hope, expect, and look after." That which in all these interpretations is aimed at, wherein they all agree, is one and the same thing,—namely, that the Gentiles, people, heathen, should be called and gathered unto the Shiloh, should hear his doctrine, obey his law, and be made subject unto him.

Now, as this was eminently contained in the great, fundamental promise concerning the Messiah made to Abraham, namely that "in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed," so there is not any description of him in the following prophets more eminent than this, that "unto him the gathering of the people should be," which in many places is made the characteristical note of his person and kingdom. Hence some of the Jews themselves, as Rabbi Solomon, interpret this place by that of Isa. xi. 10, אֵלָיו גּוֹיִם יִדְרֹשׁוּ,—"To him shall Gentiles seek;" and that of chap. xlii. 4, וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ אִיִּים יְיַחֲלוּ,—"The isles shall wait for his law." The sense also of the words given by the LXX. and the Vulgate, προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, "expectatio gentium," has good countenance given unto it in other places of Scripture: for as he is called, Hag. ii. 7, חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם, "The desire of all nations," that which they desire and expect; so speaking of himself, Isa. lx. 9, he says, לִי אִיִּים יְקַוּוּ, "The isles" (the same with גּוֹיִם, "the Gentiles") "shall wait for me," or "expect me." Now, he to whom the *Gentiles* shall *seek*, whose *doctrine* they shall *learn*, whose *law* they shall *obey*, to whom they shall be *subject*, in whom they shall

be *blessed*, and to whom they shall be *gathered* for all these ends and purposes, is the true and only Messiah; and this is the Shiloh here mentioned.

31. We have the concurring assent of all the Targums unto this application of the word "Shiloh." Ben Uzziel: עד זמן די ייתי מלכא משיחא;—"Until the time wherein the King Messiah shall come." The same are the words in that of Jerusalem; both of them, as we saw before, interpreting the next words also of the Messiah. And Onkelos to the same purpose: עד־דייתי משיחא דדיליה היא מלכותא;—"Until the Messiah shall come, whose is the kingdom." Now, after the Scripture itself, there is no greater evidence of the persuasion of the old church of the Jews than what is found in the consent of these Targums; and of how little validity the exceptions of the modern Jews are against their authority is known to all.

32. And we have also the concession of their Talmuds and most learned masters, fully consenting in this cause. So in the Talmud of Jerusalem, in Chelek. "The world," say they, "is created for the Messiah, ומה שמו, and what is his name in the house of Rabbi Shiloh? They said, His name is Shiloh; as it is written, 'Until Shiloh come.'" And in Bereshith Rabba, on this place of Genesis, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh come:" זה משיח בן דוד;—"This is Messiah the son of David, who shall come to rule the kingdoms with a sceptre," as Ps. ii. And in Bereshith Ketanna, "Until the Shiloh come, שעתידין אימות עולם; for it shall come to pass that the nations of the world shall bring their gifts unto Messiah the son of David." And Kimchi in שלה: פירושו בנו והנבואה על המשיח;—"'Shiloh' is interpreted 'his son;' and it is a prophecy of the Messiah." And innumerable other testimonies from them to the same purpose may be produced; yea, this sense is so common among them, and so known to have been the sense of the ancient church, that the wisest among them turn every stone to retain this interpretation of the words, and yet to avoid the force of the testimony insisted on from them.

33. This, then, we have obtained from this testimony, namely, that the *political rule* and national government should not absolutely and irrecoverably be removed and taken away from the tribe of Judah until the promised Seed should be exhibited, until the Messiah should come. It remaineth, THIRDLY, that we also evidence that all rule, government, and polity, is long since taken away from, and ceased in, Judah, and that for many generations there hath been no such thing as a tribe of Judah in any national or political condition or constitution in the world. And had we not here to do with men obstinate and impudent, there would need very few words in this matter; but they must have that proved unto them which all the world sees and knows, and takes care to make good, and which themselves, as occa-

sion serves, confess and bewail. Is it not known to all the world, that for these sixteen hundred years last past they have been scattered over the face of the earth, leading a precarious life, under the power of kings, princes, commonwealths, as their several lots in their dispersion have fallen, "sine Deo, sine homine rege?" Cast out of God's especial care, they wander up and down, without law, government, or authority, of their own or amongst themselves. And this, as I said, themselves also confess, as they have occasion. To this purpose see Kimchi on Hos. iii. 4, ואלה הם ימי הגלות שאנחנו בו היום;— "And these are the days of captivity, wherein we are at this day; for we have neither king nor priest of Israel, but we are in the power of the Gentiles, and under the power of their kings and princes." Doth this man think that sceptre and lawgiver are departed from Judah, or no? And the Targum of Jonathan on that place is considerable; for saith he, "The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king of the house of David, and without a ruler in Israel: afterwards the children of Israel shall repent, and seek the worship of the Lord their God, and shall obey the Messiah, the son of David, the king." So also are the words of Abarbanel on Isa. liii. He tells us that in their captivity and banishment, part of their misery is שלא היה בישראל מלכות ולא ממשלת ולא שבט משפט;— "that in Israel there is neither kingdom, nor rule, nor sceptre of judgment;" that is, plainly, sceptre and lawgiver are departed: and therefore, if there be any truth in this prophecy, the Messiah is long since come. In like manner Maimonides: "From the time that we have left our own land, we have no power of making laws." And they jointly confess, in the Talmud. Tract. Sanhed., that some time before the destruction of the temple, all power of judging, both as unto life and death, and as unto pecuniary punishments, was taken from them: so that if there be any certainty in any thing in this world, it is certain that sceptre and lawgiver are long since departed from Judah.

34. There are not many things wherein the present Jews do more betray the desperateness of their cause, than in their endeavour to obscure this open and known truth in matter of fact. That which they principally insist upon, is a story out of the Itinerary of Benjamin Tudelensis.

This Benjamin was a Jew, who about five hundred years ago passed out of Europe into the eastern parts of the world, in a disquisition of his countrymen and their state and condition; whereof he hath given an account in his Itinerary, after the manner of vulgar travellers. Among other things which he relates, *fide rabbinica*, he tells us of a Jew that hath, or rather then had, a principality at Bagdad, whom his countrymen called "The son of David," there being a thousand of them living there all in subjection unto him. This

honour was allowed him by the caliph who in those days ruled there; so that when he passeth in the streets, they cry before him, "Make way for the son of David." Fagius long since returned a proper answer to this story in a proverb of their own, רוצה לשקר ירחיק עדיו;—"He that hath a mind to lie, let him place his witnesses at distance enough." When Benjamin passed over those eastern parts of the world, they were greatly unknown to Europeans, and he had thence advantage to feign what he pleased for the reputation of his nation; which he was not wanting to the improvement of. Time hath now brought truth to light. The people of Europe, especially the English and Hollanders, have some while since discovered the state of things in those parts, and can hear no tidings of Benjamin's principality, nor his son of David; nor could the Jews ever since get any one to confirm his relation. Besides, if all that he avers should be granted to be true, as in the main it is undoubtedly false, what would it amount unto as to the matter in hand? Is this the sceptre and lawgiver promised unto Judah, as the great privilege above his brethren? It seems, an obscure, unknown person in Bagdad, in captivity, by the permission of a tyrant, whose slave and vassal he is, hath a pre-eminence among a thousand Jews, all slaves to the same tyrant!

And this is all they pretend unto in שבט יהודה, in the forty-second story, where they give us an account of this נשא or ריש הגולה, "prince" or "head of the captivity," as they would have him esteemed. A rich Jew they would make him to be, chosen unto a presidentship by the heads or rectors of the schools of Bagdad, Sora, and Pombeditha; and they confess that for many ages they have chosen no such president, because the Saracens killed the last that was so chosen. Is this, I say, the continuance of the tribe and sceptre of Judah? Judah must be a nation, a people, in a political sense and state, dwelling in their own land, and have rule and dominion exercised therein according to their own law, or the sceptre and lawgiver are departed from them; and this they evidently are sixteen hundred years ago: and therefore the Shiloh, the promised Messiah, is long since come; which is the truth whose confirmation from this testimony was intended.

EXERCITATION XIII.

OTHER TESTIMONIES PROVING THE MESSIAH TO BE COME.

1. Other testimonies proving the Messiah to be come—Hag. ii. 3, 6–9; Mal. iii. 1. 2. State of the people at the building of the second temple, in the days of Darius Hystaspes, not Nothus. 3. The house treated of by Haggai the second house; 4 Proved against Abarbanel. 5. The glory promised to this house. 6. Brief summary of the glory of Solomon's temple—Its prejec-

tion; 7. Magnificence. 8. Treasure spent about it. 9. Number of workmen employed in it. 10. Ornaments. 11. Worship. 12. Second temple compared with it—Pretensions of the rabbins about its greatness and duration removed—What was the glory promised to the second house—Opinion of the Jews. 13. The promise of it not conditional—The meaning of יַעֲשׂוּ in the text—Evasions of Abarbanel, Kimchi, and Aben Ezra examined. 14. Their opinion of the glory promised to the second house—Of the greatness of it—Things wanting in it by their own confession. 15. The glory of this house not in the days of the Asmonæans or Herodians; 16. Not in its continuance. 17–24. Circumstances proving the true Messiah to be the glory—Anomalous construction of the words removed. 25, 26. Mal. iii. 1 explained. 27–29. Confession of the ancient Jews.

1. We shall now proceed to other testimonies of the same evidence and importance with the foregoing. The end of calling and separating the people of the Jews from the rest of the world, the forming of them into a nation, and the setting up of a *political* state and rule amongst them, being solely, as we have declared, to bring forth the promised Messiah by them, and to shadow out his spiritual kingdom, it was necessary that he should come before their utter desolation and final rejection from that state and condition; which also he did, according to the promise and prediction before insisted on and explained. The same was the end of their *ecclesiastical* or church state, with all the religious worship that was instituted therein. Whilst that also, therefore, continued and was accepted of God, in the place of his own appointment, he was to be brought forth and to accomplish his work in the world. This also, in sundry places of the Old Testament, is foretold. One or two of the most eminent of them we shall consider, and manifest from them that the true Messiah is long since come and exhibited unto the world, according to the promise given of old to that purpose. The first we shall fix upon is that of Haggai, chap. ii. 3, 6–9, whereunto we shall add Mal. iii. 1. The words of the former place are, "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing? Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts." Those of the latter are, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." Both to the same purpose.

2. The occasion of the former words must be inquired after from the story of those times in Ezra, and the whole discourse of the prophet in that place. The people, returning from their captivity with Zerubbabel, in the days of Cyrus, had laid the foundation of the temple: but having begun their work, great opposition was made against it, and great discouragements they met withal; as it will fall out with all men that engage in the work of God in any generation. The kings of Persia, who first encouraged them unto this work, and countenanced them in it, Ezra i. 7, 8, being possessed with false reports and slanders, as is usual also in such cases, at first began to withdraw their assistance, as it should seem in the days of Cyrus himself, chap. iv. 5, and at length expressly forbade their proceedings, causing the whole work to cease "by force and power," verse 23. Besides this outward opposition, they were moreover greatly discouraged by their own poverty and disability for the carrying on their designed work in any measure, so as to answer the beauty and glory of their former house builded by Solomon. Hence the elders of the people, who had seen the former house in its glory, "wept with a loud voice" when they saw the foundation of this laid, chap. iii. 12, 13, as foreseeing how much the splendour and beauty of their worship would be eclipsed and impaired; for as the measures of the fabric itself, assigned unto it by Cyrus, chap. vi. 3, did no way answer Solomon's structure, so for the ornaments of it, wherein its magnificence did principally consist, they had no means or ability to make any provision for them. Being therefore thus hindered and discouraged, the work ceased wholly from the end of Cyrus' reign unto the second year of Darius Hystaspes; for there is no reason to suppose that this intercision of the work continued unto the reign of Darius Nothus. Between the first year of the whole empire of Cyrus and the second of Darius Nothus, there were no less than a hundred years, as we shall afterwards declare. Now, it is evident in Ezra that Zerubbabel and Joshua, who began the work in the reign of Cyrus, were alive and carried it on in the days of Darius; and it is scarcely credible that they, who, it may be, were none of the youngest men when they first returned unto Jerusalem, should live there a hundred years, and then return unto the work again. Outward force and opposition, then, they were delivered from in the second year of Darius Hystaspes; but their discouragements from their poverty and disability still continued. This the prophet intimates, Hag. ii. 3, "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes as nothing?" There is no necessity for reading the words with a supposition, as Scaliger contends, "If there were any amongst you who had seen;" for it is much more likely that some who had seen the former house of Solomon, and wept at the laying of the foundation of this in the days of Cyrus, should now see the

carrying of it on in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, that is, about ten or twelve years after, than that those who began the work in the reign of Cyrus should live to perfect it in the second year of Darius Nothus, a hundred years after. However, it is evident that the old discouragement was still pressing upon them. The former house was glorious and magnificent, famous and renowned in the world, and full of comfort unto them, from the visible pledges of the presence of God that were therein. To remove this discouragement, and to support them under it, the Lord by his prophet makes them a promise, that whatever the straitness and poverty of the house were which they undertook to build, however short it came of the glory of that of old, yet, from what he himself would do, he would render that house far more glorious than the former,—namely, by doing that in it for which both it and the former were instituted and erected. Saith he, גָּדוֹל יִהְיֶה כְּבוֹד הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאַחֲרוֹן מִן־הָרִאשׁוֹן;—"The glory of this latter house shall be great above that of the former." To clear our argument intended from these words, we must consider,—first, What was this latter house he spoke of; secondly, Wherein the glory of it did consist.

3. First, We are to inquire what house it is whereof the prophet speaks. Now this is most evident in the context. 'This house,' saith he, verse 3, 'that your eyes look upon, and which you so much despise in comparison of the former;' and verse 7, 'I will fill, saith the LORD, הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה, this house which you are now finishing with glory;' and, verse 9, it is called הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאַחֲרוֹן, "this latter house." The prophet doth, as it were, point to it with his finger. '*This house* that you and I are looking upon; this house, which is so contemptible in your eyes in comparison with that of Solomon, which you have either seen or read of; this house shall be filled with glory.' It is true, this temple was three hundred years after re-edified by Herod, in the eighteenth year of his reign: which yet hindered not but that it was still the same temple; for this first structure was never destroyed, nor the materials of it at once taken down, but notwithstanding the reparation of it by Herod, it still continued the one and the same house, though much enlarged and beautified by him; and therefore the Jews, in the days of our Saviour, overlooked, as it were, the re-edification of the temple by Herod, and affirmed that that house which then stood was "forty and six years in building," John ii. 20, as they supposed it to have been upon the first return from captivity, when the whole work and building of Herod was finished within the space of eight years. The Targum also of Jonathan, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi, and others, interpret the words of that house which was then building by Zerubbabel and Joshua, nor do any of the ancient Jews dissent.

4. Abarbanel, one of their great masters, and chief among them

who invent pretences for their impenitence and unbelief, in his comment on this place, after he hath endeavoured his utmost against the interpretations of the Christians, and made use of the reasonings of former expositors, to apply the whole prophecy unto the second house, at least as it was restored by Herod, at length refers all that is spoken of the house here unto a *third temple*, prophesied of, as he fancieth, by Ezekiel, to be built in the days of the Messiah; because he saw that if the *second house* was intended, it would be hard to avoid the coming of the Messiah whilst that house stood and continued. But we need not insist long in the removal of this fond imagination: for,—(1.) It is contrary to express redoubled affirmations in the text before insisted on: (2.) To the whole design of the context and prophecy, which is expressly to encourage the Jews unto the building of that house, which seemed so contemptible in the eyes of some of them: (3.) To the repetition of this prophecy, Mal. iii. 1, where the second temple is evidently expressed: (4.) To the prophecy of Ezekiel, wherein a spiritual and not a material temple is delineated, as we shall elsewhere demonstrate: (5.) To the time assigned to the glorifying of the house spoken of, עוֹד אַחַת מְעַט הִיא, "yet a little while," which in no sense can be applied unto a temple to be built longer afterwards than that nation had been a people. From the call of Abraham to the giving of this promise, there had passed about fourteen hundred and ten years; and it is now above two thousand years since this prophecy, which in what sense it can be called "a little while" is hard to imagine. This, then, is the sense that Abarbanel would put on these words, "It is yet a little while, and I will fill this house with glory;" that is, 'A very great while hence, longer hence than you have been a people in the world, I will cause another house to be built'! (6.) It is contrary to the Targums, and all the ancient masters among the Jews themselves: (7.) To itself; for it is, by his own confession, promised that the Messiah should *come to the temple* that is promised to be filled with glory, but the other third temple that he fancies, is, as he said, to be built by himself, so that he cannot be said to *come unto it.* So that this evasion will not yield the least relief to their obstinacy and unbelief. It is evidently the second temple, built by Zerubbabel, whose glory is here foretold.

5. The glory promised unto this house is nextly to be considered. This is expressed absolutely, Hag. ii. 7, "I will fill this house with glory;" and comparatively, with reference unto the temple of Solomon, which some of them had seen, verse 9, "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." To understand aright this promise, we must reflect a little upon the glory of the first house, which the glory of this second was to excel. It would not answer our present design to digress unto a particular descrip-

tion of Solomon's temple; it is also done by others with great judgment, diligence, and accuracy. I shall therefore only give a brief account of some of the heads of its excellency, which our present argument doth require.

6. First, then, It was very glorious from its principal *architect*, which was God himself. He contrived the whole fabric, and disposed of all the parts of it in their order; for when David delivered unto Solomon the pattern of the house and the whole worship of it, he tells him, "All these things the LORD made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern," 1 Chron. xxviii. 19. God gave him the whole "in writing;" that is, divinely and immediately inspired him by his Holy Spirit to set down the frame of the house, and all the concernments of it, according to his own appointment and disposal. This rendered the house *glorious*, as answering the wisdom of Him by whom it was contrived. And herein it had the advantage above all the fabrics that ever were on the earth, and in particular the second temple, whose builders had no such idea of their work given them by inspiration.

7. Secondly, It was glorious in the *greatness, state, and magnificence, of the fabric itself.* Such a building it was as was never paralleled in the world; which sundry considerations will make evident unto us, as,—

First, The *design of Solomon*, the wisest and richest king that ever was in this world, in the building of it. When he undertook the work, and sent to Hiram, king of Tyre, for his assistance, he tells him that "the house which he was to build was to be great, because their God was great above all gods," 2 Chron. ii. 5. Nay, saith he, "The house which I am about to build shall be wonderful and great." No doubt but he designed the structure to be magnificent to the utmost that his wisdom and wealth could extend unto. And "what shall he do that cometh after the king?" What shall any of the sons of men think to contrive and erect, to enlarge that in glory wherein Solomon laid out his utmost? There can, doubtless, be no greater fondness, than to imagine that it could in any measure be equalled by what was done afterwards by Zerubbabel or Herod.

8. *Secondly*, The vast and unspeakable sums of *treasure* which were expended in the building and adorning of it. I know there is some difference among learned men about reducing the Hebrew signatures of moneys unto our present account; but let the estimate be as low as by any can reasonably be imagined, setting aside what Solomon expended of his own revenue and getting, the provision left by David towards the work, of "an hundred thousand talents of gold, and a thousand thousand talents of silver, besides brass and iron without weight, with timber and stone," 1 Chron.

xxii. 14, doth far exceed all the treasures that the greatest part, if not all the kings of the earth, are at this day possessed of. For, on the ordinary computation and balance of coins, the gold amounted to £450,000,000,[1] and the silver unto £3,750,000,000, besides what was dedicated by his princes, and out of his peculiar treasure. He that would be satisfied what immense sums of his own Solomon added to all this, may consult Villalpandus on this subject. And what might be the product of this expense, wisely managed, is not easy to be conceived. It seems to me that the whole revenue of Herod was scarce able to find bread for Solomon's workmen; so unlikely is it that his fabric should be equal unto that other. It was surely a glorious house that all this charge was expended about.

9. *Thirdly*, It appears further from the *number of workmen* employed in the structure. We need not greaten this number out of conjectures with Villalpandus, who reckons above four hundred thousand, seeing there is evident mention in the Scripture of an hundred and fourscore and three thousand and six hundred, besides

[1] The value of the talent is variously estimated. If the talent of gold, according to one estimate, amount in value to £5,075, the total sum would be £507,500,000; if, according to another estimate, it amount to £5,250, the total would be £525,000,000; if to £5,475, the total would be £547,500,000. Again, the talent of silver has been valued at £342, 3s. 9d. by some; at £353, 11s. 10d. by others; and at £375 by others. The total sums would thus be respectively, £342,187,500, or £353,591,666, 13s. 4d., or £375,500,000.

If we calculate according to the specified weight in ounces, valuing the gold at £3, 10s. and the silver at 5s. per ounce, the results would be £525,000,000, and £375,000,000. We make these remarks, inasmuch as it is somewhat difficult to understand on what principles the calculations in the text above were made, and there is reason to fear some inaccuracy in the printing. The following remarks on this matter by Dr Kitto are deserving of attention:—

"The stated numbers are found in the Book of Chronicles, which was written after the Babylonish captivity. Now, it is reasonable to suppose that the people, most of whom were born and bred in Chaldea used the weights and measures of that country —of which we have, indeed, a singular proof in the fact that the Persian and Chaldean gold coin called the *daric* is mentioned in the computation of the donations of the nobles, although the coin was assuredly unknown in David's time. Then the value of the Babylonian talent was greatly less than that of the Hebrews; that of the talent of gold being £3 500, and of silver £218, 15s., which would reduce the entire amount to about £600,000,000. This, though an immense reduction, seems still to be far too large, and some therefore think the Syriac talent to be intended, which was but one-fifth of the Babylonian. This would bring it down to the comparatively reasonable, and not absolutely impossible, sum of £120,000,000. There is an independent corroboration of this in the fact that Josephus, whether by so reading in the original text as then extant, or by reducing the talents into talents of account, produces nearly the same result, by making the talents of gold not more than ten thousand, and of silver a hundred thousand. Even this sum seems far too large in comparison with any thing known to our experience; but we have no determinate data on which it may be further reduced, without supposing a corruption of the text of Chronicles. This is possible, from the facility with which numbers are corrupted in the course of time, and from the circumstance that the numbers of Chronicles repeatedly differ from those of the same account in the Book of Kings, and are always in excess; which hence may be the case here also, where there is no parallel text in Kings to supply the means of comparison. It is certain that the details in Kings, so far as given, are favourable to a lower estimate."—ED.

the Tyrians that were hired, who, by their wages, seem also to have been a great number, 2 Chron. ii. 10; that is, there were an hundred and fifty-three thousand and six hundred strangers, of the posterity of the Canaanites, verses 17, 18, and thirty thousand Israelites, 1 Kings v. 13. Neither was all this multitude engaged in this work for a few days or months, but for full seven years, verse 38; and therein, as Josephus observes, the speed of the work was almost as admirable as its magnificence. And what a glorious structure might be raised by such numbers of men, in such a space of time, when nothing was wanting unto them, which by the immense treasures before mentioned could be procured, may easily be conceived. It doth not appear that the whole number of the people, rich and poor, who were gathered together under Zerubbabel after the return from the captivity, did equal the number of Solomon's builders; so that they were not like to erect a fabric answerable unto what he erected: nor can it be imagined that Herod employed so many in the whole work as Solomon had to oversee his labourers.

10. We may add hereunto what is recorded concerning the *adorning of this house.* Not to mention the pillars of brass, with their chapiters, whose magnificence was wonderful, and workmanship inimitable; the molten sea with the oxen, and the like ornaments innumerable: if we do but consider that the whole house, upon the vaulting and ceiling with cedar, was overlaid with pure beaten gold, how glorious must it needs be rendered to the thoughts of every man who remembers the greatness of the structure! In especial, those utensils of the sanctuary, the ark, oracle, mercy-seat, and cherubims, that represented the presence of God, what tongue can represent their beauty and glory! In the second house there was little of all these; and for the things of most cost and charge, nothing at all. Nor did the riches of this house consist only in the solid parts of the fabric, but in those vast treasures of silver and gold, with other precious things, which, being dedicated to the service of God, were laid up therein; for besides what was consecrated by himself and his princes, Solomon brought in all the things which David his father had dedicated, 2 Chron. v. 1, and put them among the treasures of the house of God. And although I do not think with some, that the whole sums of money before mentioned were herein included, because it was dedicated by David, for so also was his brass, and iron, and timber,—it is all to be expended about or used in the building of the house itself,—yet I cannot but judge that those treasures were exceeding great, and such as the poverty and confusion of the people under the second temple never allowed them to do any thing that was answerable unto it.

11. Lastly, The glory of *the worship of this temple* consummated its beauty. Now, this was principally founded on the glorious en-

trance of the שכינה, or "divine presence," into it, upon its consecration by the prayer of Solomon. Hereof God gave a double pledge:—First, The *falling down of the fire* from heaven to consume the first offerings, and to leave a fire to be kept alive perpetually upon the altar,—a type of the effectual operation of the Holy Ghost, making all our sacrifices acceptable to God; and this the Jews expressly confess to have been wanting in the second temple, 2 Chron. vii. 1. Secondly, The *glory of the Lord*, as a cloud, filling the whole house, and resting upon it, verses 2, 3. This foundation being laid, and attended with a sacrifice of many thousands of cattle, the whole worship was gloriously carried on, according to the institution revealed unto David by the Spirit of God. And the better to enable them to a right performance hereof, some of the chief ministers, as Heman, Ethan, and Jeduthun, were themselves inspired with the Spirit of prophecy. So that, plainly, here we had the utmost glory that a worldly sanctuary and carnal ordinances could extend unto.

12. Having taken this brief view of the glory of Solomon's temple, we may now inquire after what that "*glory*" was which was promised to this second house, concerning which the prophet affirms expressly that it shall excel all the glory which on any account belonged unto the first. And, FIRST, we shall consider the apprehension of the Jews in this matter:—First, Some of them plainly insinuate that this whole promise was *conditional*, and depended upon the obedience of the people; wherein they failing, it is no wonder if the promise was never accomplished. Thus Abarbanel would have the prophet speak to them: אם ייטבי מעשיהם בשמירת התורה;—"If your works be right in the observation of the law." And to this end Kimchi, after Aben Ezra, giveth us a new connection of the words; for that expression, Hag. ii. 4, "Be strong, all ye people of the land, וְעֲשׂוּ," "and work," he carries on to the beginning of the next verse, ועשו: טעמו דבק עם הפסיק האחר את הדבר הזה אם תעשו את הדבר אשר כרתי אני אהיה אתכם;—"'And work:' it coheres in sense with the following verse, or this word, 'If ye do the work that I covenanted with you;'" and so leaps over those words in the end of verse 4, and whereon the whole fifth verse doth evidently depend, "For I am with you, saith the LORD of hosts." And these following words, "So my Spirit remaineth among you," he interprets for a promise depending upon the same condition, "If ye do the word that I covenanted with you;" that is, observe the law: אבל אחר שחטאו ולא עשו התורה נפסקה רוח הקדש נפסקה הנבואה בימי זכריה ומלאכי;—"But after they sinned, and observed not the law, the Holy Ghost and prophecy ceased from amongst them, in the days of Zechariah and Malachi." And to the same purpose Abarbanel: השכינה הנבואה ושאר הדברים הקדושים;—"The glorious Presence, prophecy, and the rest of the holy things that were then wanting, should

return unto them, if their ways were right and good." And in this fancy they all agree.

13. But this wresting of the text is evident. There is no condition intimated in the words, but rather the contrary; God promising to be with them, as he was in the days of their coming out of the land of Egypt, wherein the work that he wrought for them depended not on their obedience, but was a mere effect of his own faithfulness, as he often declares. And these words, וְרוּחִי עֹמֶדֶת בְּתוֹכְכֶם, "And my Spirit standing" ("abiding" or "remaining") "in the midst of you" ("among you"), is no promise of any thing that was future, but a declaration of the presence of God by his Spirit then amongst them, to carry them through all difficulties and discouragements that they had met withal. And this is evident from the inference that is made thereon, אַל־תִּירָאוּ, "Fear ye not;" for as the presence of God with them, by his Spirit and power, was their great encouragement, so a promise of any thing that was future was not suited unto that purpose. And hence the Targum of Jonathan, supposing the Spirit of prophecy to be intended, referreth the words to the prophets that were then amongst them, who instructed them in the will of God. But by the "Spirit," nothing is there intended but the efficacious working of the providence of God in their protection, as it is explained, Zech. iv. 6, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the LORD of hosts;" and the trajection of the words invented by Kimchi is a bold corruption of the text, and contrary to the whole design of the prophet's message to the people. His business was, to encourage them to go on with the building of the temple. To this end he bids them be strong and do their work. עשו הבנין הזה, saith Rabbi Levi;—"Work on this building;" carry on this fabric. ועבידו, saith Jonathan;—"Fall to your labour." And thereunto he adds the encouragement from the presence of God, who was powerfully present with them by his Spirit, as in the days that he brought them out of the land of Egypt.

14. This evasion being of no use, something more satisfactory must be inquired after, something wherein the glory of the latter house must excel that of the former. That they may not be utterly silent, the masters of the present Judaical infidelity fix upon two things, which they would persuade us this glory might consist in:—First, they say the structure itself, either as built by Zerubbabel, or at least as restored by Herod, was *higher*, as more capacious, than that built by Solomon; and the glory of it was increased by the *great riches* of the nations, that were brought into it in the days of the Asmonæans and of Herod, when that was accomplished which was here foretold, that the riches of the nations should come to that house. So Kimchi: "'I will shake.' This is an allegorical expression," saith he, "of the great glory and good that God would bring to Israel in the days of the second temple. And when

was this?" זה היה בימי חשמוני;—"It was in the days of the Asmonæans," או על זמן הורדוס, "or in the time of Herod;" for which he refers us to the book of Joseph Ben Gorion, the plagiary of the true Josephus. And this also is repeated by Jarchi and Abarbanel. For the glory of the house itself, the same man tells us that his masters, of blessed memory, were divided, some referring it unto the *time of the standing* of the second house, of which afterwards; some, to its *greatness.* And for its greatness, he informs us the second house, היה גדול בבנין כמו שכתוב בדברי רזל ובספר יוסף בן גוריון כי הבנין שבנה הורדוס לא נראה מעולם בנין טוב ונאה כמוהי,"—"in the structure of it, was great; as it is written in the words of our rabbins of blessed memory, and in the book of Joseph Ben Gorion, namely, that there was no building in the whole world to be compared with that structure which Herod built, for beauty and excellency."

But there are not many of this opinion, and those that pretend themselves so to be speak contrary to their own science and conscience. They know well enough that the latter temple was in nothing to be compared unto the former. And this Abarbanel acknowledgeth in the entrance of his exposition of this prophecy, affirming that the people were troubled at the remembrance of the house built by Solomon, which was great and high, filled with multitudes of vessels of pure gold and precious stones, whereas that which they were building was small, according to the command of the king of Persia, and without treasure, because of the poverty of the people; and though this house was built higher by Herod, yet it was not at all enlarged by him, but erected precisely on the old foundation. But, not to enter at present into consideration of the measures of the former structure, let the latter temple be thought as wide and long as the former, and some cubits higher, doth this presently give it a greater glory than the other?—a glory so much greater as to be thus eminently promised and intimated to be brought in with the shaking of heaven, and earth, and sea, and dry land? Can any thing more fondly be imagined? It were endless to reckon up the particular instances wherein it came short of the glory of the first house. Let but the heads of the beauty and magnificence thereof above recounted be run over, and this will quickly appear. In a word, notwithstanding the imaginary greatness pretended, it had not the hundredth part of the glory of Solomon's house, which also these masters on all occasions acknowledge; for besides all the glorious golden vessels and ornaments of it, besides all the treasures deposited in it, besides sundry of the most magnificent parts of the building itself, they generally acknowledge that there were five things wanting in the last, wherein the principal glory of the first house consisted. These are diversely reckoned up by them, but in general they all agree about them; and they are given us by the

author of Aruch in the root כבד in this order: ארון כפורת וכרוב אחד, —"The ark, propitiatory, and cherubims," *one;* that is, the whole furniture of the sanctuary. שכינה שני,—"The Divine Majesty or Presence," *the second.* It entered not into the house in that glorious and solemn manner that it did into the temple of Solomon. רוח הקדוש שהוא נבואה שלישי,—"The Holy Ghost, which is prophecy," *the third;* all prophecies ceasing under that house from the days of Malachi unto John Baptist. אורים ותומים רביעי,—"Urim and Thummim," *the fourth thing.* אש מן השמים חמישי,—"Fire from heaven," to kindle the everlasting fire on the altar, *the fifth thing.* They that acknowledge all these things to have been wanting in the second temple, as the Jews generally do, and the Talmud in יומא, chap. v., expressly, cannot well compare the glory of it with the glory of that temple wherein they were, and whereof they were indeed the chiefest glory and the most eminent pledges of the presence of God therein.

15. The pretence about the glory of this house from the riches of the Asmonæans and Herod is no less vain. That which amongst the Asmonæans had the greatest appearance of glory was their *high priest* (who also came irregularly unto that office), assuming the royal power and titles. But this, as themselves confess, was a sinful disorder, and their whole race was quickly extirpated before Herod the Great. It is well they are on this occasion reconciled unto him, whom elsewhere they execrate as an usurper, cruel tyrant, and slave to the Romans;—all which he was indeed. Little glory came to the temple by his rule and sovereignty. Besides, during his reign and the rule of the remainder of his race, the high priests were thrust in and out at the pleasure of brutish tyrants; no order in their succession, no beauty in their worship, being observed or sought after. Hence, comparing the *number* of high priests under the second temple with that of them under the first, which it trebly surmounts, they apply unto it that of Solomon, "Because of the wickedness of the people, the rulers are many." To seek for the glory mentioned among these things and persons is assuredly vain.

16. Wherefore, others of these masters, waiving these empty pretences, would have the glory of this second house to consist in its *duration.* So R. Jonathan in Bereshith Rabba, Jarchi on this place, and Kimchi, whose opinion is repeated by Abarbanel. Kimchi tells us that their masters are divided in this matter; and Jarchi, that it was Raf and Samuel that were the authors of this different opinion, the one affirming that the glory of this house consisted in its *greatness,* the other in its *duration.* And their dispute in this matter is in Perek Kama of Bava Bathra. בית ראשון ארבע מאות ועשר בית שני ארבע מאות ועשרי;—"The first house," saith he, "continued four hundred and ten years, the second four hundred and twenty." This

is their account, though in truth it continued longer, as did the first house also. But is this the "glory" promised? What was the condition of that house in those ten years, and almost half ten times ten years before? The whole nation during this space of time was shattered and wasted with oppressions, seditions, and miseries inexpressible; and the house itself made "a den of thieves," and, for the greatest part of the ten years they boast of, filled with cruel bloodshed and daily murders. And is it likely that a mere duration in that season, wherein, for what it was put unto, it was abhorred of God and all good men, should in this prediction of its state deserve that prophetical eulogy, of obtaining more glory than the house of Solomon was ever made partaker of? There is, then, nothing more evident than that these inventions are evasions of men who diligently endeavour to hide themselves from light and truth, not in the least answering either the letter of the prophecy or the intention of Him that gave it.

17. SECONDLY, It remaineth, then, that we inquire from the text what is the *true glory* promised unto this house, wherein it was to have the pre-eminence above the former. Now, this is expressly said to be the "coming unto it of the desire of all nations:" "The desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory; and the glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." This is directly affirmed to be the glory promised, and nothing else is in the least intimated wherein it should consist. And there are three circumstances of this glory expressed in the text:—First, The way whereby it should be brought in: "I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land: and I will shake all nations." Secondly, The season wherein this was to be done: "Yet once, it is a little while." Thirdly, The event of it: "And in this place will I give peace, saith the LORD of hosts." All which are severally to be considered, and the intendment of the Holy Ghost in them vindicated from the objections of the Jews.

18. The first thing we are to inquire after, is the glory itself that is promised in these words, וּבָאוּ חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם,—"And the desire of all nations shall come." The Jews by these words generally understand the *desirable things* of the nations, their silver and gold,—which above all things are unto them most desirable. These, they say, the nations being shaken, did bring unto the temple; and therein the glory of it did consist. Herein all their expositors on this place, Jarchi, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, and others of them, whose judgments are repeated by Abarbanel, do agree. Aben Ezra briefly: "The nations shall be shaken, and shall bring מנחות לביתי," "gifts unto my sanctuary." ויביאו תשורת זהב וכסף, "And they shall bring the treasures of gold and silver," saith Jarchi, as it is recorded in the book of Joseph Ben Gorion. Kimchi to the same purpose, somewhat largely:

כלומר יביאו בידם כל דברי חמודות שימצאו בארצם מכלי כסף וזהב בגדים ואבנות יקרות;—"As if it had been said, They shall bring in their hands all desirable things that are found in their lands, vessels of silver and of gold, garments, and precious stones." And this, as I said, is their general sense.

But, *first*, It is directly contrary unto the context; for it is the plain design of the Holy Ghost to take off the thoughts of the people from that kind of glory which consisted in coacervation of ornaments of silver and gold; which being all of them always in his power, he could at that time have furnished them withal, but that he would have them look for another glory. *Secondly*, It is perfectly false as to the event; for when was there such an outward shaking of all nations under the second temple as that thereon they brought their silver and gold unto it, and that in such abundance as to render it more rich and glorious than the house of Solomon? So to wrest the words, is plainly to aver that the promise was never fulfilled; for nothing can be more ridiculous than to make a comparison between the riches and treasures of Solomon's temple and those which at any time were laid up in the second temple. Besides, what was so, was but gifts and oblations of the people of the Jews; which the nations sometimes took away, but never brought any thing unto it. And therefore themselves which use this evasion dare not place the excelling glory of this house herein, though the text doth plainly affirm that it doth consist in what these words intend, but turn to other imaginations, of largeness and duration. *Thirdly*, Open force is offered unto the words themselves: for they are not, וְיָבִיאוּ כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם הַחֲמֻדוֹת,—"And all nations shall bring their desirable things;" but, בָּאוּ חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם,—"The desire of all nations shall come." So woful is the condition of men rebelling against light, that they care not into what perplexities they run themselves so they may avoid it! Abarbanel having repeated all these expositions, and seeing, no doubt, that they would not endure a tolerable examination, would have "The desire of all nations" to be Jerusalem, because they should all come up to war against it, with a desire to take it, in the days of the third temple, which he fancieth to be here intended! There are scarce more words than monsters in this subterfuge. It may suffice for its removal, that we have already demonstrated that his figment of a third temple is devoid of any pretence to cover it from open shame.

19. We say, then, that these words contain a prophecy of the Messiah, and of the real glory that should accrue unto the second temple by his coming unto it whilst it was yet standing. This is the importance of the words, וּבָאוּ חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם. The LXX. give us a corrupt interpretation of the words: Καὶ ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν·—"And choice things of all nations shall come;" in which

error they are followed both by the Syriac and Arabic translators. Τὰ ἐκλεκτά doth in nothing answer to חֶמְדַּת, the word here used by the prophet, and retained by Jonathan in the Chaldee Targum; who indeed is not unfaithful in places relating unto the Messiah, so as to excludes him, although he perverts the true meaning of many of them. The Vulgar Latin hath rightly to the sense rendered these words: "Et veniet desideratus cunctis gentibus;"—"And he shall come who is the desired of all nations." חֶמְדַּת, from חָמַד, is properly "desiderium," "desire," but is nowhere used in the Scripture but for a thing or *person desired*, or desirable, loved, valued, or valuable; as is חֲמוּדוֹת also, Dan. ix. 23, x. 11, xi. 8, 43; Gen. xxvii. 15; Ezek. xxiii. 6; Amos v. 11; Jer. iii. 19; Isa. ii. 16. This, I say, is the constant use of the words, to denote the person or thing that is desired or desirable. And it being said here emphatically that this desire shall "come," nothing but a desired or desirable person can be intended thereby: and this was no other but the Messiah, the bringing of whom into the world was the end of the building of that temple and of the whole worship performed therein; and therefore by his coming unto it, it had the complement of its glory. The promise of him of old unto Abraham was, that "in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed." Until his coming they were generally to be left to walk in their own ways, and in the issue everlastingly to perish. By him were they to be relieved; and so he is rightly called their "desire," or he that, *de jure*, ought to be desirable above all things unto them. "The desire of all nations," and he "to whom the gathering of the people should be," that is, "the Shiloh," are one and the same. It is true, being filled with blindness and ignorance, the ages past before his coming had *de facto* and actively no desire after him; but as there was a secret groaning and tendency in the whole nature of things after his production, so he, when he came, who was alone to be desired by them, was actually received and embraced as the full accomplishment of their desires. That, then, wherein all their blessedness and deliverance were laid up, may be properly called their "*desire*," because containing all things truly *desirable*, and because, like *desire fulfilled*, it was perfectly satisfactory unto them when enjoyed.

20. The only difficulty in the interpretation of these words lies in their unusual construction. The verb בָּאוּ, "shall come," is of the plural number, "venient;" חֶמְדַּת, "the desire," whereunto we refer it, of the singular: "Desiderium omnium gentium venient." Kimchi observing this anomaly, to suit the words unto his own sense, affirms that ב is wanting, which should be prefixed to חֶמְדַּת, and so be rendered, "All nations shall come with their desire,"—that is, their desirable things, their silver and gold; but there is no need of

this arbitrary supply of the text, and the sense contended for by him we have sufficiently disproved. Nor is it unusual in the Hebrew tongue, where two substantives are joined in construction, that the verb agrees in number and person, not with that which directly and immediately it respects, but with that whereby it is regulated.[1]

As חֶמְדַּת here is put *in statu constructo* by גּוֹיִם, and the verb from thence put in the plural number, so 2 Sam. x. 9, "Joab saw כִּי־הָיְתָה אֵלָיו פְּנֵי הַמִּלְחָמָה,"—"that the face of battle was against him." The verb הָיְתָה, "was," which refers directly to פְּנֵי, "the face," agrees not in number with it, but with מִלְחָמָה, "the battle," by which the other is put in construction. So Job xv. 20, מִסְפַּר שָׁנִים נִצְפָּנוּ;"—"The number of years is hid." נִצְפָּנוּ, "are hid;" it agrees with שָׁנִים, "years," and not with מִסְפַּר, "the number," in the very same kind of construction with that of the words here used by the prophet. So likewise, 1 Sam. ii. 4, קֶשֶׁת גִּבֹּרִים חַתִּים;—"Arcus fortium confractorum." The adjective, חַתִּים, "broken," agrees in number with גִּבֹּרִים, "the mighty," though it be apparently spoken of the "bow." And likewise, Hos. vi. 5, מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ אוֹר יֵצֵא;—"Thy judgments shall go forth as the light." יֵצֵא, "shall go forth," agrees in number vith אוֹר, "the light," though it respects מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ, "thy judgments," in the plural number. And many other instances of the like kind may be alleged to the same purpose. This construction, then, though *anomalous*, yet is in that language so *frequent* as not to create any difficulty in the words; and yet, possibly, the words may not be without a further sense, intimating the *coming of the nations* to Christ upon his *coming to the temple.*

21. Though the words of the promise are thus clear in themselves, we may yet see what further light is contributed unto our interpretation from the circumstances before observed; as, first, the *way* of bringing in this glory is there expressed by the prophet from the mouth of the Lord: "I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land: and I will shake all nations." All the Jewish expositors agree that these words are to be interpreted על דרך משל; that is, metaphorically and figuratively. Yet it cannot be denied that a great concussion and shaking of the world, and all the nations of it, is intended in them, otherwise nothing is signified by them; and this must be with reference unto that house and the worship thereof, and that in a tendency unto its glory. Now, I desire to know what work among the nations in the whole world it is that was wrought with respect unto the temple which is here intended. The nations came, indeed, under Antiochus, and almost ruined it;

[1] The rule, as given by Gesenius, is, "When a subject is composed of a nominative and a genitive, the verb sometimes conforms in gender and number to the genitive instead of the governing noun, especially when the word in the genitive expresses the principal idea."—Ed.

under Crassus, and robbed it; under Pompey, and profaned it; under Titus, and destroyed it. But what tended all this to its glory? But refer these words unto the coming of the Messiah, and all things contained in them were clearly fulfilled. Take the words *literally*, and they suit the event. At his birth a *new star* appeared in the heavens; *angels* celebrated his nativity; *wise men* came from the east to inquire after him; *Herod and all Jerusalem* were shaken at the tidings of him: and upon his undertaking of his work, he wrought *miracles* in *heaven*, and *earth*, *sea*, and *dry land*, upon the whole creation of God. Take them *metaphorically*, as they are rather to be understood, for the mighty change which God would work in his worship, and the stirring up of the nations of the world to receive him and his doctrine, and the event is yet more evident. All nations under heaven were quickly shaken and moved by his coming. Some were stirred up to inquire after him, some to oppose him, until the world, as to the greatest and the most noble parts of it, was made subject unto him. Evident it is that, since the creation of all things, never was there such an alteration and concussion in the world as that wherewith the Messiah and his doctrine were brought into it, and which is therefore so expressed by the prophet.

22. Abarbanel affirms that the חכמי הנוצרים, "Christian doctors," would argue and prove from hence that it is not the *temple of the Jews*, but their own *house of worship*, that is intended in these words; and that because there was no such confluence of the nations under the Jews, either under the first or second temple, as is here promised, but unto their church and faith all nations were converted. But he mistakes and confounds things, as all of them constantly do in their disputations against Christians. We contend not that it is the *Christian church* that is here intended by the house that glory was to come unto. Only we say, that He to whom the nations, or Gentiles, were to be gathered, whom they were shaken and stirred up to receive, did actually come unto the temple at Jerusalem, and thereby gave it a greater glory than whatever the temple of Solomon received. This first circumstance, then, clears our intention from this text.

23. The *season* wherein the promised glory was to be brought in is next noted in the context. It is expressed, Hag. ii. 6, עוֹד אַחַת מְעַט הִיא. The Jews generally refer these words unto the rule or kingdom of the Asmonæans, under whom the people were to enjoy their liberty, which is said to be a *little season*, as continuing seventy or eighty years; for it is said to be *little* because they had but a small dominion in comparison of their former kingdom and empire. But it is evident from the context that the prophet had no respect unto rule or dominion in these words; for whatever is intended in this expression, it hath a direct and immediate influence into the bringing in

of the "desire of all nations" and the "glory" promised, which the rule of the Asmonæans reached not unto. Our apostle, Heb. xii. 26, renders these words, עוֹד אַחַת, literally and properly, ἔτι ἅπαξ, "yet more once," or "yet once more." God had before done some work, whereunto that which he promised now to do is compared. Such a concussion of all things had been before; and this, as is evident from Hag. ii. 5, was the work that he wrought at the *giving of the law*, and the erection of the Judaical church-state and ordinances. In answer hereunto he would bring in the *everlasting kingdom of the Messiah*, and the spiritual worship to be celebrated therein, the old church-state of the Jews in this shaking of all things being removed and taken away.

And this plainly is evinced from the comparison that God makes between the work here promised and that which he wrought when he covenanted with the people upon their coming up out of Egypt. Concerning the work which God will thus do "once more," it is said to be עוֹד מְעַט, "a little while;" that is, ere it be accomplished. It is not the nature or *quality* of the work, but the *season* or time wherein it shall be wrought, that is denoted in these words. In that sense is מְעַט often used in the Scripture, as we prove elsewhere; as the same work, Mal. iii. 1, is promised to be done פִּתְאֹם, "suddenly," *speedily*. It is, then, foretold that it should be but a little space of time before this work should be wrought; and hence Abarbanel would prove that it cannot respect the coming of our Messiah, which was about four hundred years after. But this season is not called "a little while" absolutely, but with respect unto the former duration of the people or church of the Jews; either from the calling of Abraham or the giving of the law by Moses. And this space of four hundred years is but "a little" in comparison thereof; and is so termed to stir up believers unto a continual expectation of it and desire after it, it being now nearer unto them than unto their forefathers, who beheld the time of its performance *a very great way off*. And this also serves for the conviction of the Jews; for whereas their forefathers of old did confess, and themselves at present cannot with any modesty deny, but that the Messiah is here intended, whom they suppose not yet to be come, how can this space of time from the days of Haggai in any sense be called "a *little while*," seeing it far exceeds all the space of time that went before from the call of Abraham, which is the first epoch of their privilege and claim?

24. The last circumstance contributing light unto our interpretation of this place is taken from the *event*, or the *coming of "the desire of all nations,"* and the glory of the second house ensuing thereon, in these words: וּבַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה אֶתֵּן שָׁלוֹם;—"And in this place I will give peace, saith the LORD of hosts." From these words Abarbanel seeks to overthrow our exposition. "By 'this place,'" saith he, "is intended

Jerusalem." Well, let that be granted, what will thence ensue? Why, saith he, הנה מיום שנולד משיחם לא היה שלום ירושלם;—"Behold, from the day that the Messiah was born, there was no peace in Jerusalem, but wars, destruction, and desolation." We say, then, that by "peace" here must be understood either *outward*, temporal, worldly peace, or spiritual peace between God and man, between Jews and Gentiles in their joint communion in the same worship of God. If they say the former was intended, I desire to know when this promise was accomplished under the second temple? Before the days of the Asmonæans, the whole people were in perfect bondage and slavery, first to the Persians, then to the Grecians; and *bondage* is not "peace," especially in the Hebrew dialect, wherein that word denotes an affluence of all good things. The rule of the Asmonæans was wholly spent in *bloody wars* and intestine divisions. Their power issued in the dominion of the Romans, and their vassals the Herodians. What signal peace they had in those days they may learn from their own Joseph Ben Gorion. To say, then, that this was the peace intended, is to say indirectly that God promised what he never performed; which is fit only for these men to do.

Besides, though God promised to give this peace *at* Jerusalem, that is, amongst the Jews, yet he promised not to give it only *to* Jerusalem, unto the Jews, but to all nations also, whom he would shake and stir up, to bring in this glory. Now what pretence of peace had the Jews under the second temple, wherein all nations were concerned? I suppose they will not say they had any. Moreover, the peace promised was that which was to be brought in by the Messiah. This Abarbanel grants, and thence seeks to strengthen his objection; for saith he, "Then we shall have peace, rule, and dominion, according to the manifold promises given us unto that purpose." I answer, Those promises are of two sorts. Some express spiritual things allegorically, by words literally signifying things outward; and they are all of them fulfilled in and unto them that do believe: others of them, that really intend outward peace and glory, are made concerning them, to be fulfilled, not when the Messiah comes to them, but when they shall come to the Messiah. At his coming unto them, they rejected him, and he rejected them; but when their blindness shall be taken away, and they shall return unto the Lord, all these promises shall have a blessed accomplishment amongst them. But we have sufficiently proved that the principal work of the Messiah was to make peace between God and man by taking away *sin*, that was the cause of their separation, distance, and enmity. This, then, is the "peace" here promised. This God gave at Jerusalem, whilst the second temple was standing: for "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even

the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to them that were afar off, and to them that were nigh." Thus did God give "peace" at Jerusalem, both to the Jews and Gentiles, by Him that was the "desire of all nations;" and so by this circumstance of the context also is our interpretation fully confirmed.

25. Although we have sufficiently confirmed our argument, and vindicated it from the exceptions of the Jewish masters, yet, because it is most certain that the constant faith of their church of old was, that the Messiah should come whilst that second temple was standing, which they have now apostatized from and renounced, countenancing themselves in their infidelity by the miserable evasions before mentioned, I shall add yet further strength unto it from a *parallel testimony*, and from their own confessions. The parallel place intended is that of Mal. iii. 1, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: even the angel" (or "messenger") "of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts." The time future of his coming is by Haggai said to be מְעַט הִיא, "a little while;" and he (*i. e.*, Malachi) answerably affirms that he shall come פִּתְאֹם, "suddenly," in the sense before declared. He who by Haggai is called חֶמְדַּת כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם, "The desire of all nations," with respect unto the Gentiles, all desirable things being laid up in him, is by Malachi called הָאָדוֹן אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם מְבַקְּשִׁים, with respect unto the Jews, "The Lord, whom ye seek," whose coming they looked for so long, and prayed for so earnestly. And what Haggai expressed absolutely, "shall come," afterwards intimating the respect his coming should have unto the temple, Malachi sets down fully, יָבוֹא אֶל־הֵיכָלוֹ,—"He shall come unto his temple." Further to clear what it is that in both these places is intended, he is called, מַלְאַךְ הַבְּרִית, "The angel of the covenant," God's "messenger," who was to confirm and ratify the new covenant with them; that is, the Messiah. The Targum of Jonathan expresseth it on Jer. xxx. 21, closing the promise of the covenant with these words, ויתרבא מלכיהון מנהון ומשיחיהון מבניהון יתגלי; —"And their King shall be anointed from among them, and their Messiah shall be revealed from amongst the midst of them." He who was "the desire of all nations," "the Lord" whom the Jews sought, "the messenger" by whom the new covenant was to be ratified, that is, the Lord the Messiah, was to come, and he did come, unto that temple.

26. And here the Jews are at an end of all shifts and evasions. It cannot be avoided but the Messiah must be here intended. Rashi would fain yet evade: "'The Lord, whom ye seek;' that is,

אֱלֹהֵי הַמִּשְׁפָּט,—'The God of judgment;' because they had said before, chap. ii. 17, 'Where is the God of judgment?'" Vain man! these words, which he himself had but just before interpreted to be the atheistical expression of wicked men questioning the judgment of God, are now, to serve his turn, an earnest desire of seeking after the Lord, which in these words is evidently set forth, "The Lord, whom ye seek," "The angel of the covenant, whom ye delight in;" for both these are the same, as Aben Ezra acknowledgeth: האדון הוא הכבוד הוא מלאך הברית כי הטעם כפול;—"The Lord, he is the glory and the angel of the covenant; the same thing being intended under a double expression." And it is evident whom he intends thereby, by his interpreting the "messenger" to be sent before him to be Messiah Ben Joseph, whom they make the forerunner of Messiah Ben David.

Kimchi interprets the angel to be sent before him, "The angel of God's presence from heaven," to lead the people out of their captivity, as of old he went before them in the wilderness, when they came out of Egypt. But we are better taught who this messenger was, Matt. xi. 10, Mark i. 2. As for "the Lord, whom they sought," he speaks plainly: הוא מלך המשיח הוא מלאך הברית;—"This is the King the Messiah, and this the angel of the covenant." He adds, indeed, the old story about Elijah and his zeal for the covenant, whence he had the honour to preside at circumcision, to see the covenant observed, and may be thence called the angel of the covenant. But it is plain in the words, and confessed by Aben Ezra, that "the Lord whom they sought," and "the angel of the covenant," are the same. And as to these words, פִּתְאֹם יָבוֹא אֶל־הֵיכָלוֹ,—"He shall come suddenly to his temple," he adds in their explication, לפי שלא נגלה הקץ ולא נתבאר בספר דניאל אמר כי פתאום יבא שלא ידע אדם יום בואו טרם בואו שיבא;—"Because the time of the end is not revealed or unfolded in the book of Daniel, it is said "he shall come suddenly," because there is no man that knows the day of his coming before he come." We grant that the precise day of his coming was not known before he came; but that the time of it was foretold, limited, and unfolded, in the book of Daniel,—so far as the season and age of it would admit was made evident, all future expectation declared to be void, and that in the book of Daniel,—we shall immediately demonstrate. At present we have proved, and find that they cannot deny, but that he was to come unto the second temple, whilst it was yet standing.

27. Once more, we may yet add the consent of others of their masters besides these expositors. Some testimonies out of their doctors are cited by others. I shall only name one or two of them. In the Talmud itself, Tractat. Sanhed., cap. xi., the application of this place of Haggai unto the Messiah is ascribed unto Rabbi Akiba.

His words, as they report them, are: מעט כבוד אתן להם לישראל ליא אחר כך יבא המשיח;—"A little glory will I give unto Israel, and then the Messiah shall come." And this man is of so great repute among them that Rabbi Eliezer affirms that כל חכמי ישראל, "all the wise men of Israel were like a little garlic in comparison of that bald rabbi." This, then, is their own avowed tradition. And the other place of Malachi, concerning the angel of the covenant, is expounded of the Messiah by Rambam in הלכות מלכים. "In the days," saith he, "of the Messiah, the children of Israel shall be restored unto their genealogies by the Holy Ghost, that shall rest upon him; as it is said, 'Behold, I send my messenger before me, and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall come unto his temple.'"

We have found out, then, both from the clear words of both these prophecies and the consent of the Jews themselves, who it is that is here promised in them, that he should come to his temple.

28. This is the glory of the second house promised in Haggai. The end of the temple, and of all the glory of it, and all the worship performed in it, was to prefigure the *promised Seed*, who was the true and only substantial glory of them all, and of the people to whom they were committed; for he was to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel." Therefore, in all the worship of the temple, those who believed, and, in the use of the ordinances of it, saw unto the end of their institution, did continually exercise faith on his coming, and earnestly desire the accomplishment of the promise concerning it. The great glory, then, of this temple could consist in nothing but this coming of the Lord whom they sought, the desire of all nations, unto it. Now, that he should come whilst the temple stood and continued is here confirmed by this double prophetical testimony; and the temple being utterly and irreparably destroyed now above sixteen hundred years ago, it must be acknowledged that the Messiah is long since come, unless we will say that the word of God is vain, and his promise of none effect.

29. The general exception of the Jews unto this argument, taken from the limitation of the time allotted unto the coming of the Messiah, we shall afterwards consider. In one word, that which they relieve themselves withal against the predictions of Haggai and Malachi, that he should come unto the temple then built amongst them, which they acknowledge, is so *truly ridiculous* that I shall not need to detain the reader with the consideration of it. They say the Messiah was born at the time determined, before the destruction of the second temple, but that he is kept hid in the sea, or in paradise, or dwells at the gates of Rome among the lepers, waiting for a call from heaven to go and deliver the Jews! With such follies do men please themselves in the great concernments of the glory of God and their own eternal welfare, who are left desti-

tute of the Spirit of light and truth, and sealed up under the efficacy of their own blindness and unbelief. But hereof we shall treat further in the consideration of their general answer to this whole argument in hand.

EXERCITATION XIV.

DANIEL'S PROPHECY VINDICATED.

1. Daniel's weeks, chap. ix. 24–27, proposed unto consideration. 2. Attempt of a learned man to prove the coming and suffering of the Messiah not to be intended, examined. 3. First reason, from the difficulties of the computation and differences about it, removed. 4. Whether this place be used in the New Testament. 5. Objection from the time of the beginning of this computation answered. 6. Distribution of the seventy weeks into seven, sixty-two, and one—Reason of it. 7. Objection thence answered. 8. The cutting off of the Messiah and the destruction of the city, not joined in one week. 9. Things mentioned, verse 24, peculiar to the Messiah. 10. The prophecy owned by all Christians to respect the Messiah. 11. The events mentioned in it not to be accommodated unto any other. 12. No types in the words, but a naked prediction. 13, 14. The prophecies of Daniel not principally intending the churches of the latter days. 15. Straits of times intimated, when they fell out. 16. Coincidence of phrases in this and other predictions considered. 17. Removal of the daily offering, and causing the sacrifice and offering to cease, how they differ. 18. The desolation foretold. 19. Distribution of the seventy weeks accommodated unto the material Jerusalem. 20. Objections removed. 21. Distribution of things contained in this prophecy. 22. Argument from the computation of time warranted. 23. First neglected by the Jews, then cursed; yet used by them vainly. 24. Concurrent expectation and fame of the coming of the Messiah upon the expiration of Daniel's weeks. 25. Mixture of things good and penal—Abarbanel's figment rejected. 26. Four hundred and ninety years the time limited—Fancy of Origen and Apollinaris. 27. The true Messiah intended, proved from the context. 28. The names and titles given unto him. 29. The work assigned unto him. 30. That work particularly explained—The expressions vindicated—To "make an end of transgression," what. 31. To "seal up sins." 32. To "reconcile iniquity." 33. To "bring in everlasting righteousness." 34. To "seal vision and prophet." 35. Messiah how cut off. 36. The covenant strengthened. 37. Ceasing of the daily sacrifice. 38. Perplexity of the Jews about these things—Cyrus not intended by "Messiah." 39. Opinion of Abarbanel and Manasseh Ben Israel—Not Herod Agrippa. 40. Not magistracy—Africanus, Clemens, and Eusebius noted. 41. Messiah came before the ceasing of the daily sacrifice. 42. Exact chronological computation not necessary.

1. THERE remains yet one place more, giving clear and evident testimony unto the truth under demonstration, to be considered and vindicated; and this is the illustrious *prediction and calculation of time* granted unto Daniel by the angel Gabriel: Chap. ix. 24–27, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins,

and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." So our translation reads the words, how agreeably unto the original we shall consider and examine particularly in our progress.

2. Of what importance this testimony is in our present cause and contest, as Christians generally acknowledge, so the Jews themselves are in a great measure sensible, as we shall see in the consideration of those manifold evasions which they have invented to avoid the efficacy and conviction of it. But before we engage into its management and improvement, an attempt against our apprehension of the whole design, intendment, and subject-matter of the prophecy itself, must be removed out of our way. A reverend and learned person, in a late exposition of the visions and prophecies of Daniel, endeavouring to refer them all unto the state of the churches of Christ in these latter days of the world, with their sufferings under and deliverance from the power of Antichrist, amongst the rest contends expressly that this prophecy, prediction, and computation, doth not relate unto the coming and suffering of the Messiah, but only unto the state of the churches before mentioned. Hence, he who published those discourses declareth, in the title of the book, that "a new way is propounded in it for the finding out of the determinate time signified unto Daniel in his seventy weeks, when it did begin, and when we are to expect the end thereof."[1] And a NEW WAY it is indeed, not only diverse from, but, upon the matter, contrary unto the catholic faith of the church of God, both Judaical and Christian, ever since the first giving out of the prophecy. And such a way it is as is not only groundless, as we shall discover in the examination and trial of it, but also dangerous unto the Christian faith, if received. Yet, because the author of it (if he be yet alive) is a person holy, modest, and learned, and proposeth

[1] He refers to "The Visions and Prophecies of Daniel Expounded," by Thomas Parker a Puritan divine, who went to New England in 1634, and died in 1677.—ED.

"his conjectures with submission unto the judgment of others, not peremptorily determining what he says," p. 51, his discourse deserves our consideration, and a return unto it, with a sobriety answerable unto that wherewith it is proposed. And herein we shall attend unto the method chosen by himself; which is, first, to give reasons and arguments to prove that this prophecy cannot be applied unto the coming of the Messiah; and then those which countenance, as he supposeth, the application of it unto these latter days; both which shall be examined in their order.

3. That which in general he first insisteth on as a reason to abjudicate this prediction from the times of the Messiah, is the difference that is among learned men about the chronological computation of the time here limited and determined. The variety of opinions in this matter he terms "monstrous;" and the difficulties that attend the several calculations, "inextricable." But whether this reason be cogent or no unto his purpose is easy to determine, yea, it seems to have strength on the other side; for notwithstanding the difficulties of the *exact computation* pretended, not one of them whom he mentions, nor scarce any other person, ancient or modern, before himself, or a very few besides, did ever doubt or call in question whether the time designed did concern the coming of the Messiah or no. And it seems to be a great evidence of the truth thereof, that no difficulty in the computation did ever move them to question the principle itself.

Besides, that this is indeed no tolerable argument, namely, that learned men cannot agree in the exact computation of any time appointed unto such an end, to prove that it was not designed unto that end, is evident from other instances in the Scripture to the same purpose. Thus, God tells Abraham that his seed should sojourn in a strange land "four hundred years," Gen. xv. 13; which Stephen repeats, Acts vii. 6. After this, Moses, with some difference in the years themselves, affirms that their sojourning in Egypt was "four hundred and thirty years," Exod. xii. 40; which St Paul repeats, Gal. iii. 17. Now, learned men greatly differ about the right stating of this account, and from what time precisely the computation is to be dated, and that on the very same reason which divides their judgments in the stating of these weeks in Daniel: for as in this place of Daniel, the angel fixing the beginning of the time limited unto "the going forth of the decree to build Jerusalem," there being several decrees at several seasons, made as it should seem to that purpose, they are not agreed from which of them precisely to begin the account; so Paul affirming that the "four hundred and thirty years" began with the giving of the promise unto Abraham, it having been several times and at several seasons solemnly given unto him, there is great question from which

of them the computation is to take its date and beginning. And yet, as, notwithstanding this difficulty, never any man doubted but that the years mentioned contained the time of Abraham and his posterity's being in Egypt, so no more, notwithstanding the difficulties and difference pleaded about the computation of these weeks of Daniel, did ever any doubt but that the time limited in them was that allotted unto the Judaical church and state until the coming of the Messiah. The like difference there is amongst learned men about the beginning and ending of the seventy years in Jeremiah allotted unto the Babylonish captivity; and that because the people were carried captive at three different times by the Babylonians.

There is therefore, indeed, no weight in this exception, which is taken merely from the weakness and imbecility of the minds of men not able to make a perfect judgment concerning some particulars in this divine account; which, as we shall afterwards manifest, is of no great importance as to the principal, yea only, end of the prediction itself, whether we can do so or no. But yet that this difficulty is not so "inextricable" as is pretended, but as capable of a fair solution as any computation of time so far past and gone, we shall, I hope, sufficiently evidence in the account that shall be subjoined unto our exposition and vindication of the prophecy itself.

4. From this general consideration the learned author proceeds to give five particular reasons to prove his opinion, which we shall examine in their order; and the first is as followeth:—

"Because," saith he, "in no place of the New Testament is this prophecy used against the Jews to prove the Messiah already come."

Ans. Might this reason be allowed as cogent, it would disarm the Christian church of the principal testimonies which in the Old Testament it hath always rested in to prove that the Messiah is long since come, and that Jesus of Nazareth is he; for as any of that nature are sparingly recorded in the writings of the gospel, so of the most evident and illustrious unto that purpose there is no mention at all therein. And it is most evident, that, as well in dealing with the Jews as in his instruction of his own disciples, the Lord Jesus made use of innumerable other testimonies than what are recorded in the books of the New Testament. So also did his apostles and other primitive teachers of the gospel. Hence are *they* said to prove Jesus to be the Christ out of Moses and the prophets, and *he* to have instructed his disciples out of Moses and all the prophets in the things concerning himself; and yet the particular places whereby the one and other were performed are not recorded.

Besides, this reason laboureth under another unhappiness, which is, that it is grounded upon a mistake; for indeed this prophecy is expressly made use of in the New Testament to denote the time by us allotted unto it, and that by our Lord Jesus Christ himself. For,

Matt. xxiv. 15, 16, speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, which, according unto this prediction, was immediately to succeed upon his coming and suffering, he says unto his disciples, "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand,) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." That which here is called βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, or τῶν ἐρημώσεων,—as the words of the evangelist are inserted into the version of the LXX. in this place,—is, עַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם, "the desolator" (or "waster") "over a wing of abominations;" that is, as Luke interpreteth the words, "an army compassing Jerusalem unto the desolation thereof," chap. xxi. 20. Wherefore, our Saviour expressly applying this prophecy of Daniel to the destruction of Jerusalem, which was the consequent of his passion, plainly declares that in his suffering, and the desolation that ensued on the Jews, this whole prediction and limitation of time is fulfilled, and ought not to be sought after in any other season of the church. And this is abundantly sufficient, not only to render the foregoing reason utterly useless, but also to supersede all the following considerations and arguments, as those which contend directly against the interpretation of this prophecy given us by the Lord Christ himself. But yet, having made this entrance, we shall examine also the ensuing reasons in their order.

5. It is added, therefore, secondly, "If the restoration of the city, verse 25, is of the material Jerusalem after Nebuchadnezzar's captivity, it must begin in the first year of Cyrus, from which time seventy weeks of years will fully expire long before the birth of Christ."

Ans. There are sundry learned men who despair not to make good the computation from the first of Cyrus, whose arguments it will not be so easy to overthrow as to make their failure in chronology to be the foundation of so great an inference as that here proposed, namely, that the coming of the Messiah is not intended in this prophecy. But we shall afterwards prove that there is not only no necessity that the decree mentioned for the restoration of Jerusalem, verse 25, should be thought to be that made in the first year of Cyrus, [but] that indeed it is impossible that any such decree should be intended, seeing no such was made by him, but only *one* about the re-edifying of the temple, which here [there] is no respect unto. Another decree, therefore, express to what the angel here affirmeth, we shall discover, from whence unto the sufferings of Christ the seventy weeks are an exact measure of time.

6. He adds, thirdly, "The first division of the seventy weeks is seven weeks of years, verse 25, the end whereof is expressly characterized by the setting up of a Messiah governor; which cannot be verified in the setting up of the first governor of the Jews after the

captivity, much less of Christ; for Zerubbabel was set up in the beginning, and Christ long after the end of all. No other governor can be meant after the first, because the setting up of one pointeth at the first. Therefore, if the seven weeks end not in the setting up of Zerubbabel or Christ, as they cannot, then they cannot be verified in the material state of Jerusalem after the captivity of Babylon."

Ans. This exception fixeth on one of the greatest difficulties in the text, which yet is not such as to bear the weight of the inference that is here made from it; for the argument from the division of the time in the text is of this importance: 'Because it is said, that "from the going forth of the decree to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall in troublous times;" therefore, if the seven weeks end not in the setting up of Zerubbabel or Christ, they cannot be verified in the material state of Jerusalem after the captivity.' Now I see not the force of this argument; for the words may have another interpretation, and the separating of the seven weeks from the sixty-two, as all of them from the seventy before mentioned, excluding one out of the distribution, may be to another end than to denote either the setting up of Zerubbabel, which assuredly they did not, or the coming of Christ, which they extend not unto. In brief, they do not precisely assert that at the end of the seven weeks Messiah the Prince should be; for although they are distinguished from the other for some certain purpose not expressed, as to the determination of the time of the coming of the Messiah they are to be joined with the sixty-two weeks, as is expressly affirmed in the following words. Now, not to prevent myself, [anticipate,] in what is more largely afterwards to be insisted on, in the exposition of the several passages of this prophecy, after a full consideration of what sundry learned men have offered for the solving of this difficulty, I shall here briefly propose my apprehensions concerning it; which, I hope, the candid and judicious reader will find to answer the conduct of the context and design of the place.

7. First, I fix it here as unquestionable, that the whole space of seventy weeks doth precisely contain *the time between the going forth of the decree* and *the unction of the most Holy*, with his passion that ensued, some few years of the last week remaining not reckoned on, to keep the computation entire by weeks of years. This is so expressly affirmed, verse 24, that the interpretation of all that ensues is to be regulated thereby. And this as we shall afterwards prove, so here we take it for granted, as the hypothesis on which the present difficulty is to be solved. There is, then, a distribution of these seventy weeks into seven, sixty-two, and one, upon

the account of some remarkable events happening at the expiration of these several distinct parcels of the whole season. Verse 25, we have two portions of this time expressed, namely, seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks; and two events attending them,—Messiah the Prince, and the building of the street and wall: "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times." The two events here mentioned did ensue the two distinct parcels of time limited, but not in the order which the words at first view seem to represent, as is evident from the context: for as the Messiah did not come at the expiration of the seven weeks, so the sixty-two weeks were not expired before the building of the city; nor is that mentioned as the event designed by the whole space of sixty-nine weeks, but as that which should fall out in some interval of it; for the prophecy issues not in the restoration, but desolation of the city.

The angel, therefore, expresseth the distinct divisions of time, and the principal distinct events of them, but not the *order* of their accomplishment; for the natural order of these things is, that in seven weeks the building of the city, wall, and street, should be finished, and in sixty-two weeks after the Messiah should be cut off. And this is evident from the text; for as the building of the city can no way be said to be after the sixty-two weeks, but in and after the seven, which was the season wherein the decree was executed, so the cutting off the Messiah is expressly said in the next verse to be after those sixty-two weeks, which succeeded unto the seven weeks wherein the restoration of the city was finished. And to suppose the Messiah in verse 25 not to be the same with the Messiah, verse 26, and the most Holy, verse 24, is to confound the whole order of the words, and to leave no certain sense in them. For the single remaining week, the use of it shall be afterwards declared. This distinction, therefore, of the several portions of the whole time limited doth rather confirm our application of this prophecy than any way impeach the truth or evidence of it.

8. It is added, fourthly, "That the cutting off the Messiah, here spoken of, is expressly joined with the destruction of the city in one week, to be accomplished the last seven years; whereas Christ suffered above thirty years before the destruction of the material Jerusalem, verses 26, 27."

Ans. There appears no such thing in the text. The destruction of the city and people is only mentioned as a consequent of the cutting off and rejection of the Messiah, without any limitation of time wherein it should be performed; and *de facto* it succeeded immediately in the causes of it and direct tendency thereunto.

9. In the last place, he says, "Those phrases, verse 24, 'To finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to purge iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,' are manifest characters of the time of the end, as shall be showed."

Ans. But why are not the other ends expressed in the prophecy, namely, "To seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy," here mentioned also? Why is that phrase, לְכַפֵּר עָוֹן, translated, "To purge iniquity," whereas it rather signifies, "To make atonement" (or "reconciliation") "for iniquity?" Is it not because it would be very difficult to make any tolerable application of these things unto the season which is called "The time of the end?" In brief, these things are so proper, so peculiar unto the Lord Christ and the work of his mediation, that, in their first, direct, and proper sense, they cannot be ascribed unto any other things or persons without some impiety, and there is no reason why we should here wrest them from their native and genuine signification; all which will be fully manifested in our ensuing exposition of the words themselves.

10. I shall not here insist on those reasons and arguments whereby we prove the true and only Messiah to be intended in this prophecy; for as they are needless unto Christians, who are universally satisfied with the truth hereof, so we shall from the context and other evidences immediately confirm them against the modern Jews and their masters. In the meantime, wholly to remove this *unexpected objection* out of our way, I shall show the invalidity of those pretences which the same learned author makes use of to countenance his application of this whole angelical message unto the Christian churches of these latter days, which are these that follow:—

11. First, saith he, "Because the effects characterizing the end of those years,—the consuming of transgression, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness,—are effects to be accomplished in the Christian church at the fall of Antichrist, Isa. i. 25–28, xxvii. 9; Apoc. xxi. 27."

Ans. (1.) These are but some of the effects mentioned, and one of them not rightly expressed; there are others in the prophecy,—as the anointing of the most Holy, and cutting off the Messiah,—that can with no colour of probability be applied unto that season. (2.) However something analogous unto what is here spoken of, as an effect and product of it, may be wrought at another time, in the conformity of the church unto its Head, yet, properly and directly, as here intended, they are the immediate effects of the anointing, death, and sufferings of Jesus Christ. (3.) The places quoted out of Isaiah have no respect unto the churches of the latter days, other than all Scripture hath, which is written for their instruction.

(4.) The things mentioned, Apoc. xxi. 27, are effects of this work of Christ in and towards his church, not the work itself here expressed, as the first view of the place will manifest.

12. He adds, "In the other prophets, the restoration of the Christian church from the Babylon of Antichrist is in like types proportionably represented, Isa. x., xi., xiii., xiv.; Jer. l., li.; Apoc. xiv. 6–8, xvi. 19, xv. 7, xviii. 2, 10, 21."

Ans. (1.) I know not what is understood by, "represented in the like types." There are no types in this prophecy, but a naked prediction of the state and continuance of the Judaical church until the coming of the Messiah, and of the work that he should accomplish at his coming, with the effects and consequences thereof. To allow types in these things is to enervate all the prophecies which we have of him in the Old Testament. (2.) The places directed unto in Isaiah and Jeremiah intend not the deliverance of the Christian churches, unless it be κατὰ δεύτερον σκοπόν, and that in expressions no way coincident with or suited unto this prophecy. (3.) Where any thing is represented in *a type*, there must be an accomplishment of somewhat answerable unto it in the type itself; and such was the deliverance of the Israelites from Babylon of old insisted on by those prophets. But here our author allows no such type, but refers the whole prophecy firstly and only unto the Christian churches. (4.) In the Revelation, indeed, the deliverance of the churches of Christ from antichristian persecution is foretold; which hinders not but that the coming and suffering of the Messiah may be immediately intended, as undoubtedly it is, in this place.

13. He says, thirdly, "In all other prophecies of Daniel, the main subject of them is the history of Antichrist, and the Waldensian saints and their successors restored and reduced out of antichristian captivity. See chap. vii., ii., viii., x.–xii."

Ans. (1.) This is "petitio principii," and hath no foundation but the arbitrary hypothesis of our author: and it seems strange that there should be so many prophecies of the churches of Christ, and none amongst them of Christ himself; for this is far from the genius and strain of the Old Testament, all the principal prophecies whereof firstly and directly intend him, and the church only as built on him. (2.) Grant, therefore (for we will not needlessly contend), that some of those prophecies may concern these latter times, it doth not at all follow that this also must so do, considering the great variety of Daniel's visions; and there are arguments unanswerable that it doth not do so, as will afterwards appear.

14. It is added, fourthly, "That the parallel proportion of phrase argueth 'The anointed prince,' verse 25, to be 'The prince of the covenant,' chap. xi. 22, which there doth signify the princes of the Waldenses."

Ans. (1.) That expression, מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, verse 25, is not well rendered "The anointed prince." It is "Messiah the Prince," King, or Leader, as all translations whatever agree. And indeed this is, if not the only, yet far the most signal, place in the whole Old Testament wherein the promised Redeemer is directly called the MESSIAH, whence his usual appellation in both churches, Judaical and Christian, is taken; for there is not above one place more where he is immediately and directly so called, and not in his types; neither is that place without controversy. To interpret this expression, therefore, in this place otherwise, is to take away the foundation of that *name* of our Redeemer by which the Holy Ghost in the New Testament doth principally propose him unto our faith and obedience; which certainly would be "in prejudicium fidei Christianæ." (2.) The "prince of the covenant," chap. xi. 22, in those wars of Antiochus Epiphanes, or persecutions of Antichrist (I determine not whether), may be another from "Messiah the Prince" here promised.

15. He says, fifthly, "The straits of times, verse 25, and the destruction of the city, verse 26, do fitly agree to the antichristian persecution. See chap. viii. 24, xi. 23."

Ans. They do more fitly agree to the times of the building of Jerusalem and last destruction thereof, concerning which they are spoken. All straits and destructions have somewhat alike in them wherein they may seem to agree; but it doth not thence follow that one is intended in the prediction of another.

16. It is further urged, "The effects of the last week are parallel with the antichristian persecution described, Apoc. xi. For as the Christian church is in both places signified by the 'holy city,' Apoc. xi. 2, with Dan. ix. 26; and straits of time said in both places to go before the last afflictions, Apoc. xi. 5–7, with Dan. ix. 25; so the last afflictions are also proposed with marvellous agreement: there, three years and an half of tyranny over the conquered saints in the end of the persecution; here, half a week of years,—that is, precisely three years and an half,—cut out for the same end; the war immediately preceding the foresaid triumph, Apoc. xi. 7, here in like manner."

Ans. (1.) The *likeness* of phrases and expressions in setting out different events agreeing only in some generals, especially in the predictions that concern Christ and his church, which is predestinated to be conformed unto him, is so frequent in the prophecies of the Old Testament that nothing unto the purpose of this learned author can be concluded from such an observation concerning these places. (2.) The *Christian church* is not intended by the "city," Dan. ix. 26, but expressly that city which was to be built upon the decree of the king of Persia, whose condition was revealed unto Daniel upon his prayer for it and about it. (3.) It is no wonder that there should

be straits before desolations, at all seasons of them whatever. (4.) The half week cut off from the rest of the week is not to be three years and an half of persecution, tyranny, and triumph, but, on the contrary, it is designed for the *confirmation of the covenant* by the preaching of the gospel; so that here is nothing of the parallelism pretended in the places compared.

17. He proceeds: "From the beginning of the second half of the last week, or of the three years and an half, a prince is said to 'cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease,' verse 27; a phrase ascribed unto Antichrist, chap. viii. 11, xi. 31."

Ans. (1.) I have showed before that the similitude of phrases in different places is no ground to conclude a coincidence of the same things intended. (2.) The phrases are not the same, nor alike, in the places compared. Concerning him who is spoken of, chap. viii. 11, it is said, הֵרִים הַתָּמִיד; and of them, chap. xi. 31, הֵסִירוּ הַתָּמִיד,—"They shall take" (or "remove") "away the continual offering;" that is, hinder the observation of it and attendance unto it, when it ought to be observed. Of the prince, chap. ix. 27, it is said, יַשְׁבִּית זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה,—"He shall cause to cease sacrifice and offering," so that, *de jure*, they ought no more to be observed.

18. "In the same time," saith he, "the said prince is said, verse 27, 'for the overspreading of abominations to make desolate;' a phrase attributed unto Antichrist, chap. viii. 12, 13, xi. 31, there said to set up the 'abomination making desolate.'"

Ans. Although, great desolations and destructions being treated of in all these places, it would not be strange if the same author should express the *alike* events in the *same* terms, yet those which we are referred unto are not the same in the original, nor of any considerable correspondency. And the like may be said of another instance, which he adds in the ninth place, between an expression, chap. ix. 27, xi. 36, wherein is no agreement at all, and the places treat directly of things different, yea, contrary.

19. It is added in the last place, "That as, in the seventy weeks, the division of the seven from the sixty-two, and of both from the one week, are inapplicable to the material restoration out of real Babylon, so they will exactly and precisely agree to the restoration out of antichristian Babylon, as shall be showed."

Ans. (1.) That the distribution of the seventy weeks mentioned in the text is applicable unto the continuance of the Judaical church and state, with the coming of the Messiah and the accomplishment of his work, hath been in part already showed, and shall be fully cleared in our ensuing exposition of the place. (2.) Unto the exact answering of it unto the restoration of the church from antichristianism, I shall only say, that if men may be allowed to fix epochs arbitrarily at their pleasure, and make application of what is spoken in any place of

Scripture unto what things and persons they please, there is no doubt but that they may make their own imaginations to adhere and agree well enough together.

20. This brief view we have taken of the reasons of this reverend author, both those whereby he endeavours to prove that in this prophecy the coming of the Messiah is not intended, and those whereby he would induce a persuasion that the whole of it is not only applicable unto, but also doth directly intend, the state and condition of the church in these latter days; whereby whether he hath evinced his intention, and whether his arguments are sufficient to dispossess us of the catholic faith of the church in all ages concerning the sense and importance of this angelical message unto Daniel, is left unto the judgment of men sober and learned. For my part, I shall take it for granted that they are all of them so far removed out of our way as that we may proceed with our designed explication and vindication of this prophecy from the exceptions of the Jews, without any disturbance from them.

21. There are three things that in this illustrious prophecy offer themselves unto our consideration:—First, The general testimony given unto the coming of the Messiah, and the limitation of time wherein he should so come.

Secondly, The especial sense of the words in the several passages of it, and the distinct prophecies contained in them.

Thirdly, The chronological computation of the time designed, in an exact account of the space of time limited from the beginning unto the end.

The first of these is that wherein principally we have to do with the Jews, namely, to prove from hence that there was a time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah, which is long since expired. And all things herein we shall find clear and evident. Both the space of time limited and the several coincidences of its expiration are sufficiently manifest. In the second also we have to deal with them, in order unto the confirmation of the former. In both these the later masters have studiously endeavoured to cast difficulties and perplexities on the words; which must be removed, by the consideration of their use and genuine importance, with *the scope of the prophecy*, and the help unto the understanding of it which is contributed from other places of Scripture. The third is attended with sundry entanglements, which, although they are not absolutely "inextricable," yet are such, in respect of some minute parts of calculation, as will not suffer us to [assert] so *demonstrative a certainty* as that all men should be compelled to acquiesce therein. This is sufficiently manifested in the different calculations of the most learned of the ancient and later writers who have laboured on this subject. In reference, therefore, hereunto I shall do these

two things;—first, manifest that our argument from this place is not at all concerned in the exact chronological computation of the times whereunto the accomplishment of this prophecy relates; and, secondly, demonstrate that this difficulty is conquerable, by giving a clear and satisfactory account of the time specified and limited, such as is not liable unto any material objection.

22. FIRST, It is evident in general that here is given out by the Holy Ghost himself a computation of the time wherein the Messiah was to come and to perform the work allotted unto him. And this gives warrant unto the kind and nature of argument which we now insist upon. No small part this was of the church's treasure of old, and a blessed guide it would have been unto the faith and obedience of them concerned therein, had it been diligently attended unto; but having sinfully neglected it in its season, they have ever since wickedly opposed it. To Daniel it was granted, as a great favour, relief, and privilege, upon his deep humiliation and fervent supplications, as himself records. "Whiles," saith he, "I was speaking, and praying" ("with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes," chap. ix. 3), "and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the LORD my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. Seventy weeks," etc., verses 20–27. This was the answer that God gave him upon his great and fervent prayer for the church, and that for his relief, comfort, and supportment; whence it is evidently manifest that the great blessing of the church was inwrapped in it. And the computation of time mentioned was granted as a light to guide the Jews, that they might not shipwreck their souls at the appointed season. But when the time of its accomplishment drew nigh, they, being generally grown dark and carnal, and filled with prejudices against the proper work of the Messiah, wholly disregarded it. And since the misery that is come upon them for not discerning this time and judgment, most of them do cry out against all computations of time about the coming of the Messiah, although they are plainly called and directed thereunto by God himself; neither can they conceal the vexation which from hence they receive, by finding the design of the prophecy so directly against them Hence this place of Daniel as to the time of the coming of the Messiah, and the 53d chapter of Isaiah for his office and work, are justly esteemed the racks and tortures of the rabbins

It may not, therefore, be amiss in our way to take a little prospect of their perplexity in this matter.

23. In the Talmud Tractat. Sanhed., they have laid down this general rule, "Male pereant qui temporum articulos suppetunt quibus venturus est Messiah;" or, as they express it by a solemn curse in the name of Rabbi Jonathan, a great man among them, תיפח עצמן של מחשבי קיצין;—"Let their bones rot who compute the times of the end." And in Shebet Jehuda (wherein they follow Maimonides in Jad Chazachah, Tractat. de Regib. cap. xii.), they give a particular account of that solemn malediction against the computers of times. "It was invented," they say, "because, upon the mistakes of their reckonings or failings of their calculations, the people are apt to despond, and begin to suspect that he is already come." So openly do they own it to be an invention to shelter their unbelief against their convictions. Yet this hath not hindered some of their chiefest doctors, when they hoped to make some advantage of it (as when they saw their disciples under any distress inclinable unto Christianity), to give out their conjectures without any respect unto the Talmudical curse. So the author of Shalscheleth Hakkabala assigns the year for the coming of the Messiah to be the 5335th from the creation; which, according to their computation, fell out about the year of the Lord by our account 1575. Another would have it to be in the year 5358; that is, twenty-three years after, in the year 1598. Abarbanel in his Comment on Isaiah comes short of these, assigning it to the year 5263, or 5294 at the farthest; for he had great expectations from the issue of the wars between the Christians and Saracens that were in his days. Their utmost conjecture in Zohar is upon the year 5408; which, with their wonted success, fell out in the year of our Lord 1648, or thereabouts. And all these calculations were invented and set on foot to serve some present exigency.

But the Talmudical curse and censure are pointed directly against them that would conclude any thing from the account of Gabriel given unto Daniel in this place. This they plainly acknowledge in a disputation which they had with a converted Jew before the bishop of Rome, recorded in their Shebet Jehuda. Only, they would except Daniel himself, affirming that he was not מחשב, "a computer of the time," but ראה, "a seer;" as though the question were about the way and means whereby we attain a just computation of the time, and not about the thing itself. Daniel received the knowledge of this time by revelation, as he did the time of the accomplishment of the captivity, though he made use of the computation of time limited in the prophecy of Jeremiah; but in both he gives us a perfect calculation of the time, and so cannot be exempted from the Talmudical malediction. And I mention these things in the entrance of our consideration of this prophecy, to manifest how

far the Jews despair of any tolerable defence of their cause, if the things recorded in it be duly weighed. This, then, we see in general, that the Holy Ghost directed the church to compute the time of its spiritual deliverance by the coming of the Messiah, no less evidently than he did that of their temporal deliverance from the Babylonian captivity. Neither are there more differences among Christians about the precise beginning and ending of Daniel's seventy weeks than were and are about the beginning and ending of the seventy years of Jeremiah amongst the Jews. This rule was given them by God himself to direct and guide them, if they would have attended unto it, in that darkness and under those prejudices which the coming of the Messiah was attended withal.

24. And it is observable, that although it was not the will of God that they should exactly know the year and day of the accomplishment of this promise,—or that though they could not attain unto it, or had lost the tradition of the sense of it,—yet, about the end of the time pointed unto in this computation, they were all of them raised up to a great expectation of the coming of the Messiah. And this is not only evident from the gospel, wherein we find that upon the first preaching of John Baptist, they sent unto him to know whether he were the Messiah or no, and were all of them in expectation and suspense about it, until he publicly disavowed any such pretence, and directed them to him who was so indeed, but also from sundry other testimonies, which themselves can put in no exception unto. Their own historian tells us, that what principally moved and instigated them to undertake an unequal war with the Romans was the ambiguity (as he thought) of the oracle, that about that time one of their nation should obtain the monarchy of the world, Joseph. de Bell. Judaic. lib. vii. cap. viii.; which he, to play his own cards, wrested unto Vespasian, who was far enough from being one of their nation. Now, divine oracle about the coming of the Messiah at that season they had none but this of Daniel. And so renowned was this oracle in the world, that it is taken notice of by both the famous Roman historians who wrote the occurrences of those days: "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur," saith Tacitus, Hist. lib. v. cap. xiii.;—"Many had a persuasion that there was a prophecy in the ancient sacred books, that at that time the east should prevail, and that the governors of Judea should have the empire of the world." And Suetonius, in the life of Vespasian, cap. iv.: "Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio: esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur;"—"An ancient and constant persuasion was famous all over the east, that at that time governors of Judea should have the empire:" and this, as he adds, drew the Jews into their rebellion and war against the Romans.

Now this oracle was no other but this prophecy of Daniel, whose accomplishment at that time the Jews all over the east expected. And they acknowledge in their Talmud that they were made prodigiously obstinate in the war they had undertaken against the Romans, by their continual expectation every day and moment that their Messiah, who was to come about that time, would appear for their relief; for, because of some expressions in this prophecy, they always looked for his coming in some time of great distress. But this, through their lusts and blindness, was hid from them, that their distress indeed arose from their rejection of him who was come, and had actually called them unto that repentance which alone would have prevented it. And this persuasion, that the Messiah was to come at or about the end of Daniel's weeks, and that those weeks were now come to an end, was so fixed in their minds, that when they found that he came not, as they thought, according unto their expectation, they attempted to make a Messiah themselves, even the famous Bar-Cosba; which proved the means and cause of their utter extirpation out of the land of Canaan, as hath been declared. Thus was it with them of old, whose posterity, through obstinacy in their unbelief, do now curse all that compute the time of his coming, and, confounding it with his second appearance at the end of the world, cast it off to the last day, or a small proportion of time immediately preceding it.

25. The prophecy itself (that we may return to its consideration) contains a mixture of things good and desirable with those that are terrible and dreadful. That there is a prediction of things terrible and penal, in destructions and desolations, upon or after the close of the seventy weeks, is both plain in the text and acknowledged by the Jews. That there is any thing of mercy, love, and grace, contained in the words, some of them deny. This course takes Abarbanel in his מעיני הישועה,—"Springs" (or "Fountains") "of Salvation."

But this figment is directly contrary to the whole prophecy, the context, and express words of the text. The vision itself was granted unto Daniel in answer unto his prayer. That the design of his solemn supplication, was to obtain mercy and grace for Israel, is also plainly set down. The answer is given him in a way of mercy and love, and for his consolation in his great distress; and is it not strange that the Spirit of God should direct him to pray solemnly for grace and mercy, and give him a blessed answer for his comfort and supportment, which should contain nothing at all of the mercy prayed for, but only terrify him with wars, desolations, and destructions? As such an apprehension hath nothing in the Scripture to warrant it, so it is altogether dissonant from reason. Besides, the things mentioned and summed up, verse 24, contain the very ex-

tract of all the good things that ever were promised unto the church from the foundation of the world, and which it had for many ages been nourished with the expectation of. But these things will be more particularly evinced in our ensuing discourse.

26. For the computation itself, the Jews universally acknowledge that the sevens here denote sevens of years; so that the whole duration of the seventy sevens compriseth four hundred and ninety years. This is granted by R. Saadias Haggaon, Jarchi, and Kimchi, on the place. Here we have no difference with them or others; for it were lost labour to divert unto the consideration of the fancy of Origen, who, Hom. xxix. on Matthew, would have every seven to contain seventy years, ten years to each day, and the account to begin at the creation of the world, making the whole sum of years to be 4900, which expired, as he thought, at the coming of Christ. Apollinaris also indulged a more vain imagination, supposing the prophecy to give an account of the whole space of time from the death of our Saviour unto the end of the world.

But these fancies are exploded by all. Both Jews and Christians are generally agreed that the precise duration of the time determined is four hundred and ninety years, and that it extends not farther than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Whether it reach so far or no shall afterwards be discussed.

SECONDLY, That which we have to prove and establish from this prophecy against the Jews is,—first, That the true and only Messiah promised unto the fathers is here spoken of, and the time of his coming limited; secondly, That he was to come and to discharge his work before the expiration of the seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years from their proper date,—that is, before the sacrifice and oblation were caused to cease in the destruction of the city and temple. These things if we clearly evince from the text, we have satisfied our argument, and confirmed that the Messiah is long since come. Neither are we, as to the importance of the testimony itself, concerned in that chronological computation of the time limited, which we shall afterwards inquire into.

The *first* thing incumbent on us is, to prove that it is the true and only Messiah and his coming that are here spoken of. And this we shall do from,—(1.) The context and scope of the prophecy; (2.) The names whereby he is called; (3.) The work assigned unto him; (4.) The general confession of the Jews of old, and the follies and open mistakes of the later Jews in substituting any other thing or person in his stead.

27. (1.) The *context and scope* of the place evidence him to be intended. This in general was before declared. It was about the greatest concernment of that people that Daniel had newly made his supplications. First, The answer given him is, as the angel declares,

suited unto his desires and requests; and it contained an account of their state and condition until the consummation of all things that concerned them. The end of that people, or that for whose sake they were a church and people, was, as we have demonstrated, the bringing forth of Him in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Until this was accomplished, it was impossible, from the decree and promise of God, that they should fall under an utter rejection or final desolation. But this is plainly foretold as that which should come to pass at the end of the time here determined, or instantly upon it: יַשְׁבִּית זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם וְעַד־כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה תִּתַּךְ עַל־שּׁוֹמֵם;—"He shall cause the oblation and sacrifice to cease;" that is, utterly and everlastingly, putting thereby a period and final end unto their church-state and worship. But what then shall become of the people? "By a wing of abominations he shall make them desolate;" or cause them to be wasted and laid desolate by overspreading armies, either in themselves abominable, or abhorred by them. And in both these senses were the Roman armies כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים,—"a wing of abominations." Neither was this to endure for a season only, but unto the consummation of the whole, verse 27. Now, it was inconsistent with all the promises of God, and the sole end of his wisdom in all that he had to do with that people, that this desolation should happen before the production of the Messiah. It being, therefore, expressly said in the text that the Messiah should come before all this was accomplished, who can be intended thereby but he who was promised unto the fathers from the foundation of the world?

Secondly, This whole revelation was granted unto Daniel for his relief in the prospect that he had of the ensuing calamities of the church, and recorded by him for the supportment thereof in those distresses; as were also those prophecies of Haggai and Malachi before insisted on. Now, the only general promise which God, for the consolation of his church of old, renewed unto them in all ages, was this concerning the Messiah, wherein all their blessedness was inwrapped. This we have already manifested from Moses and all the prophets who ensued in their several generations. And he is therefore here no less intended.

Thirdly, Whatever benefit, privilege, or advantage, the church had any ground or reason to expect from the promises of God at the coming of the Messiah, they are all here expressed, as we shall immediately declare. And we may truly say, that if the things mentioned, verse 24, were to be wrought by any other than the Messiah, the church had much more reason to desire him than the Messiah himself, as for any other work which remained for him to do.

Fourthly, Unless the Messiah and his blessed work be here intended, there is not one word of comfort or relief unto the church

in this whole prophecy; for those who deny his coming to be here foretold are forced violently to wrest the expressions in verse 24 unto things utterly alien and foreign from the plain and only signification of the words. And how inconsistent this is with the design of this angelical message we have before manifested. The context, therefore, evidently bespeaks the true Messiah to be here intended.

28. (2.) The *names and titles* given unto the person spoken of declare who he is that is designed. He is called מָשִׁיחַ, "Messiah," and that κατ' ἐξοχήν, by way of eminency, and absolutely. Indeed the very name "Messiah," as appropriated unto the promised Seed, is taken from this place alone; for it is nowhere else used of him absolutely. "His Messiah," or "The Messiah of the LORD,"—that is, "his anointed,"—is often used, but absolutely THE MESSIAH, here only. And it is not probable, the name being used but once absolutely in the Scripture, that any other should be intended but he alone whose name absolutely alone it is. The name, therefore, sufficiently denotes the person.

The addition of נָגִיד, verse 25,—מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, "Messiah the Prince,"—makes it yet more evident; for as this word is often used to denote a supreme ruler, one that goeth in and out before the people in rule and government, as 2 Sam. vii. 8, 1 Kings i. 35, xiv. 7, and in sundry other places, so it is peculiarly assigned unto the Messiah: Isa. lv. 4, הֵן עֵד לְאוּמִּים נְתַתִּיו נָגִיד וּמְצַוֶּה לְאֻמִּים;—"Behold, I have given him a witness unto the people, a leader" (or "prince") "and commander unto the people." And these words are thus paraphrased by Jonathan: הא רב לעממיא מכיתיה מלך שליט על כל מלכותא;—"Behold, I have appointed him a Prince to the people; a King and Ruler over all kingdoms." This is מָשִׁיחַ הַנָּגִיד, "Messiah the Prince," Leader, or Ruler over all. And נָגִיד is the same with מוֹשֵׁל, Mic. v. 1, "the Ruler;" and רֹעֶה, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, "the Shepherd;" and נָשִׂיא, Ezek. xxxiv. 24, "the Prince;" or אָדוֹן, Mal. iii. 1, "the Lord." And to ascribe this name of מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, "Messiah the Prince," absolutely unto any but the promised Seed, is contrary to the whole tenor of the Old Testament.

Moreover, he is called, Dan. ix. 24, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "The Holiest of holies," "The most Holy;" "Sanctitas sanctitatum," in the abstract,—"The Holiness of holinesses." The most holy place in the tabernacle and temple was so called, but that cannot be here intended. The time is limited, לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים;—"To anoint" (or "to make a Messiah of") "the most Holy." But, by the Jews' confession, the holy place in the second temple was never anointed, because it was not lawful for them to make the holy oil. But suppose it was anointed, it must be so long before the expiration of these weeks, which ended, as they suppose, in its final destruction, and in truth not long before. It must therefore be the person

typified by the holy place, in whom the fulness of the Godhead was to dwell, that is here said to be anointed. Had there been any Targum on the Hebrew chapters of Daniel, we should have better known the sense of the ancient Jews in this matter than now we do. Some of them in after ages agree with us. Nachmanides tells us, קדש קדשים הוא משיח,—"This Holy of holies is the Messiah;" המקודש מבני דוד,—"who is sanctified from amongst the sons of David." So he on the place.

29. (3.) The *work assigned* to be done in the days of this Messiah here spoken of, and consequently by him, declares who it is that is intended. Sundry things there are in the text belonging unto this head: as,—first, Finishing of transgression; secondly, The making an end of sin; thirdly, Making reconciliation for iniquity; fourthly, The bringing in of everlasting righteousness; fifthly, The sealing up of vision and prophecy; sixthly, His being cut off, and not for himself; seventhly, Confirming the covenant with many; eighthly, Causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease. All these, especially as coincident, demonstrate the person of the Messiah. He that shall call to mind what hath been evinced concerning the nature of the first promise, the faith of the ancient Judaical church, the person, office, and work of the Messiah, will, upon the first consideration of these things, conclude that this is he; for we have in these things a summary of the Old Testament, the substance of all temple institutions, the centre of all promises, a brief delineation of the whole work of the promised Seed. Wherefore, although it be not an exposition of the place that we have undertaken, but merely a demonstration of the concernment of the Messiah therein, yet, because the consideration of the particular expressions above mentioned will give light into the strength of the present argument, I shall in our passage briefly unfold them.

30. The first thing designed is כַּלֵּא הַפָּשַׁע. The time determined for the coming of the Messiah is also limited, לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע, —"Ad cohibendam prævaricationem;" "to restrain, forbid, coerce, make an end of transgression." כָּלָא is "to shut, to shut up, to forbid, to coerce, to refrain, or restrain:" Ps. cxix. 101, כָּלִאתִי;—"I have refrained" (or "kept") "my feet from every evil way." Ps. xl. 12, "Thou, LORD, לֹא־תִכְלָא, wilt not withhold" (or "restrain") "thy mercy from me." So also "to shut up," or "put a stop unto," as Jer. li. 63; Hag. i. 10; 1 Sam. iii. 12; Ps. lxxxviii. 9. Thence is כֶּלֶא, "carcer," a "prison," wherein men are put under restraint. From the similitude of letters and sound in pronunciation, some suppose it to have an affinity in signification with כָּלָה, "to consummate, to end, to finish." But there is no pregnant instance of this coincidence; for although כָּלָה doth sometimes signify "to restrain" or "shut up," as Ps. lxxiv. 11, yet כָּלָא nowhere signifies "to consummate, finish," or

"complete." The first thing, therefore, promised with the Messiah, which he was to do at his coming, was, to coerce and restrain transgression,—to shut it up from overflowing the world so universally as it had done formerly. Transgression, from the day of its first entrance into the world, had passed over the whole lower creation like a flood. God would now set bounds unto it, coerce and restrain it, that it should not for the future overflow mankind as it had done. This was the work of the Messiah. By his doctrine, by his Spirit, by his grace, and the power of his gospel, he set bounds to the rage of wickedness, rooted out the old idolatry of the world, and turned millions of the sons of Adam unto righteousness; and the Jews, who deny his coming, can give no instance of any other restraint laid upon the prevalency of transgression within the time limited by the angel, and so directly deny the truth of the prophecy, because they will not apply it unto him unto whom alone it doth belong.

31. The second thing to be done at the season determined is, לְחָתֵם חַטָּאוֹת,—"to seal up sins." Τοῦ σφραγίσαι, "to seal," or "to seal up." The expression is metaphorical. To seal, is either to keep safe, or to hide, cover, and conceal. The former can have no place here, though the word seems once to be used in that sense with reference unto sin, Job xiv. 17. But this sense hath a perfect inconsistency with what is spoken immediately before, and with what follows directly after in the text. And the most proper sense of the word is "to cover or conceal," and thence "to seal," because thereby a thing is hidden, Cant. iv. 12. Now, to hide sin or transgression, in the Old Testament, is to pardon it, to forgive it. As, then, the former expression respecteth the stop that was put to the power and progress of sin by the grace of the gospel, as Titus ii. 11, 12, so doth this the pardon and removal of the guilt of it by the mercy proclaimed and tendered in the gospel. And in this way of expression is God said to "cast our sins behind his back," to "cover them," and to "cast them into the bottom of the sea." That this was no way to be done but by the Messiah, we have before evinced. Neither can the Jews assign any other way of the accomplishment of this part of the prediction within the time limited; for setting aside this only consideration, of the pardon of sin procured by the mediation of the Messiah, and there was never any age wherein God did more severely bring forth sin unto judgment, as themselves had large experience.

32. Thirdly, This season is designed לְכַפֵּר עָוֹן,—"to make reconciliation for iniquity;" "to reconcile iniquity." So our apostle ῥητῶς renders this expression, Heb. ii. 17, Ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας,—"To reconcile iniquities;" that is, Ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν Θεὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν,—"To make reconciliation with God for iniquity," "to make atonement." The sense of the word כָּפַר, when applied unto sin, is known and granted. If it be spoken of God, it is "to hide, to cover, to pardon

sin, to be gracious" unto sinners; if of men, in the use of any of his institutions, it is "to propitiate, appease, atone, make atonement or reconciliation," as I have elsewhere at large declared. How this was to be done by the Messiah hath been already evinced. This was that work for which he was promised unto our first parents from the foundation of the world. That he was to do it, we are taught in the Old Testament; how he did it, in the Gospel. To expect this work of making atonement for sin from any other, or to be wrought by any other ways or means, is fully to renounce the first promise, and the faith of the fathers from the foundation of the world.

33. That which in the fourth place is mentioned answers the former: "To make reconciliation for iniquity, and לְהָבִיא צֶדֶק עֹלָמִים," —"to bring in everlasting righteousness." There was a legal righteousness amongst the people before, consisting partly in their blameless observation of the institutions of the law, and partly in their ritual atonements for sin, made annually and occasionally. Neither of these could constitute their righteousness "everlasting." Not the former; for "by the deeds of the law can no flesh be justified,"—that is, not absolutely, whatever they might be as to the possession of the promised land. Not the latter; for, as our apostle observes, the annual repetition of legal sacrifices did sufficiently manifest that they could not make perfect them that came unto God by them.

In opposition unto these, an "everlasting righteousness," such as is absolute, perfect, and enduring for ever, is promised to be brought in by the Messiah; the righteousness which he wrought in his life and death, doing and suffering the whole will of God, being imputed unto them that believe. And this צֶדֶק עֹלָמִים, "everlasting righteousness," procureth and endeth in the תְּשׁוּעַת עֹלָמִים, "everlasting salvation," mentioned Isa. xlv. 17,—both opposed unto the ritual righteousness and temporal deliverance of the law. To declare the nature and the way of bringing in this righteousness is the design of the gospel, Rom. i. 16, 17. And I desire to know of the Jews how it was brought in within the time limited. According unto their principles, the time here determined was so far from being a season of bringing in everlasting righteousness, that by their own confession it brought in nothing but a deluge of wickedness, in the sins of their nation and oppressions of the Gentiles. This, therefore, is the proper work of the Messiah, foretold by the prophets, expected by all the fathers, and not denied by the Jews themselves at this day, though they would shamefully avoid the application of it unto him in this place. But he, whoever he be, that brings in "everlasting righteousness," he, and no other, is the promised Seed, the true and only Messiah.

34. The fifth thing here foretold is in these words: לַחְתֹּם חָזוֹן וְנָבִיא;

—"To seal vision and prophet." נָבִיא for נְבוּאָה, "prophet" for "prophecy," the concrete for the abstract. The expression, being metaphorical, is capable of a triple interpretation or application, every one of them proper unto the Messiah, his work, and the times wherein he came, and to no other. 1*st*, To "seal" is to consummate, to establish, and confirm. Things are perfected, completed, established, and confirmed, by sealing, Jer. xxxii. 44; Isa. viii. 16; John iii. 34; Rom. iv. 11. In this sense "vision and prophecy" were sealed in the Messiah. They had all of them respect unto the coming of the just One, the promised Seed. God had spoken of him "by the mouths of his holy prophets from the foundation of the world." In the bringing of him forth, he sealed the truth of their predictions by their actual accomplishment. "The law and the prophets were until John," and then they were to be fulfilled. This was the season wherein all vision and prophecy centred, this the person who was the principal subject and end of them: he therefore and his coming are here foretold. 2*ly*, To "seal" is to finish, conclude, and put an end unto any thing, Isa. xxix. 11. Thus also were vision and prophecy then sealed among the Jews. They were shut up and finished. The privilege, use, and benefit of them, were no more to be continued in their church. And this also fell out accordingly. By their own confession, from that day to this they have not enjoyed either vision or prophet. That work, as unto them, came wholly to an end in the coming of the Messiah. 3*dly*, By "sealing," the confirmation of the doctrine concerning the Messiah, his person and office, by vision and prophecy, may be intended. The visions and prophecies that went before, by reason of their darkness and obscurity, left the people in sundry particulars at great uncertainty. Now all things were cleared and confirmed. The Spirit of prophecy accompanying the Messiah, and by him given unto his disciples, foretold by Joel, chap. ii. 28, 29, was in his revelations express, clear, and evident, directing unto and confirming every thing belonging unto his person and doctrine. Neither had these words any other accomplishment but what is contained in these things.

35. Sixthly, It is affirmed that יִכָּרֵת מָשִׁיחַ,—"Messiah shall be cut off." Not "occidetur," "shall be slain," as the Vulgar Latin renders the word, but "excidetur," "shall be cut off,"—that is, penally, as one punished for sin; for the word כָּרַת, when it includes death, constantly denotes a penal excision, or cutting off for sin. See Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 15; Num. xv. 30. This the Jews themselves acknowledge to be the meaning of the word. So Rab. Saadias Haggaon in Ha-emunoth, cap. viii.: שמלת יכרת בשהיא הרגה איננה כאמרת כי אם על מי שיהרג בדין; כמו שאמר כל אכליו יכרת;—"It is not used for slaying, unless it be of him who is slain by the sentence of the judge" (or is judicially cut off), "as it is said, 'Every one that eateth of it shall

be cut off,' Lev. xvii. 14." It is foretold, then, that the Messiah shall be cut off penally, for sin; which he was when he was made a curse for sin, all our iniquities meeting upon him.

And this also is intimated in the ensuing particles, וְאֵין לוֹ,—"And not to him;" for an objection is prevented that might arise about the penal excision of the Messiah,—How could it be, seeing he was every way just and righteous? To this it is answered, by way of concession, that it was not on his own account, not for himself, but for us, as is at large declared, Isa. liii. Or, אֵין לוֹ, "not to him," may be a further declaration of his state and condition,—namely, that notwithstanding those carnal apprehensions which the Jews would have of his outward splendour, glory, wealth, and riches, yet in truth he should have nothing in or of this world, none to stand up for him,—"not where to lay his head." And this is that part of the prophecy for the sake whereof the Jews do so pertinaciously contend that the true Messiah is not here intended; for, say they, he shall not be penally cut off. But who told them so? Shall we believe the angel, or them? Will they not suffer God to send his Messiah in his own way, but they must tell him that it must not be so? To cast off prophecies, when and because they suit not men's carnal lusts, is to reject all authority of God and his word. This is that which hath proved their ruin, temporal and eternal: they will not receive a Messiah that shall suffer and be cut off for sin, though God foretold them expressly that it must be so.

36. It is added, seventhly, concerning the person here spoken of, and whose coming is foretold, הִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לָרַבִּים;—"He shall confirm" (or "strengthen") "the covenant unto many." The "covenant" spoken of absolutely can be none but that "everlasting covenant" which God made with his elect in the promised Seed, the great promise whereof was the foundation of the covenant with Abraham. And hence God says that he will "give him for a covenant of the people," Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 8; and the salvation which they looked for through him God promiseth "through the blood of the covenant," Zech. ix. 11. This "covenant" he "strengthened unto many" in the week wherein he suffered, even unto all that believe in him. This "everlasting covenant" was ratified in his blood, Heb. ix. 15; and after he had declared it in his own ministry, he caused it to be proclaimed in and by his gospel. At the time here determined, the especial covenant with Israel and Judah was broken, Zech. xi. 10; and they were thereon cast off from being a church or people. Nor was there at that season any other ratification of the covenant but only what was made in the death of the Messiah.

37. Then, also, eighthly, did he "cause to cease the sacrifice and gift," or "offering." First, he caused it to cease as unto force and efficacy, or any use in the worship of God, by his own accomplish-

ment of all that was prefigured by it or intended in it. Hereby it became as a dead thing, useless, unprofitable, and made ready to disappear, Heb. viii. 13. And then shortly after he caused it utterly to be taken away, by a perpetual desolation brought upon the place where alone sacrifices and offerings were acceptable unto God according unto the law of Moses.

And this is the third evidence that this prophecy affords unto our assertion,—namely, that it is the true, promised Messiah, and none other, whose coming and cutting off are here foretold. The great things here mentioned were fulfilled in him alone, nor had they ever the least respect unto any other. And the Jews do not in any thing more evidently manifest the desperateness of their cause than when they endeavour to wrest these words unto any other sense or purpose.

38. (4.) Moreover, besides the confession of the *ancient Jews* consenting unto the truth contended for, we have for our confirmation therein the woful perplexities of their *later masters* in their attempts to evade the force of this testimony. For some ages they have abhorred nothing more than that the true Messiah should be thought to be here intended; for if that be once granted, they know that it brings instant ruin unto the pretences of their infidelity, and that not merely upon the account of his coming, which they have invented a sorry relief against, but on that of his being penally "cut off," which can no way be reconciled unto their presumptions and expectations. But if he be not here intended, it is incumbent on them to declare who is; for the utmost extent of the time limited in the prediction being long since expired, the prophecy hath certainly had accomplishment in some one or other, and it is known or may be known in whom, or otherwise the whole angelical message never was, nor ever will be, of any use to the church of God.

But here our masters are by no means agreed amongst themselves, nor do they know what to answer unto this inquiry; and if they do guess at any one, it is not because they think it possible he should be designed, but because they think it impossible for them to keep life in their cause and not to speak when the sword of truth lies at the heart of it. Some of them, therefore, affirm the Messiah spoken of to be Cyrus, whom God calls מְשִׁיחוֹ, his "anointed," Isa. xlv. 1. But what the cutting off or death of Cyrus should make in this prediction they know not; nor do they endeavour to show that any thing here mentioned to fall out with the cutting off of the Messiah hath the least relation unto Cyrus or his death. And if, because Cyrus is once called the "anointed" of the Lord, he must be supposed to be intended in that place, where no one word or circumstance is applicable unto him, they may as well say that it is Saul the first king of Israel who is spoken of, seeing he also is called מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה, "The anointed of the LORD," 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, as was

Zedekiah also, Lam. iv. 20. But it must needs be altogether incredible unto any, unless they are Jews, who can believe what they please that serves their ends, that because the Lord calleth Cyrus his "anointed," in reference unto the especial work of destroying the Babylonian empire,—in which sense the term "anointing," namely, for a designation unto any employment, is obvious and familiar in the Old Testament,—he should therefore be esteemed the promised Messiah of the people of God, who is here evidently described. But that which casts this fancy beneath all consideration is the time allotted to the cutting off of the Messiah.

Those amongst the Jews themselves who begin the account of the weeks from the most early date imaginable, fix their epoch in the giving of the promise unto Jeremiah concerning their return from captivity, which was in the days of Jehoiakim. Now, from thence unto the death of Cyrus, no computation will allow above eighty years; which comes short somewhat above four hundred years of the season here allotted for the cutting off of the Messiah. And the same is the case with Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah, whom some of them would have to be designed: for neither were any of them *penally cut off;* nor did they cause in any sense the sacrifices to cease, but endeavoured to continue them in a due manner; nor did they live within some hundreds of years of the time determined; nor was any thing besides here foretold wrought or accomplished in their days.

39. Abarbanel, and after him Manasseh Ben Israel, with some others of them, fix on Agrippa the last king of the Jews, who, as they say, with his son Monabasius, was "cut off," or slain, at Rome by Vespasian. A learned man, in his Apparatus ad Origines Ecclesiasticas, mistakes this Agrippa for Herod Agrippa, who was σκωληκόβρωτος, Acts xii. 23. But he who died long before the destruction of the city is not intended by them, but the younger Agrippa, the brother and husband of Bernice. Neither is there any colour of probability in this fancy; for neither was that Agrippa ever properly king of the Jews, having only Galilee under his jurisdiction, nor was he ever anointed to be their king, nor designed of God unto any work on the account whereof he might be called his "anointed," nor was he of the posterity of Israel, nor did he by any thing deserve an illustrious mention in this prophecy. Besides, in the last fatal war, he was still of the Roman side and party, nor was he cut off or slain by Vespasian, but after the war lived at Rome in honour and died in peace; yea, he did not only outlive Vespasian, but Titus and Domitian, his sons, also, and continued unto the third year of Trajan, as Justus the Tiberian assures us in his History, whose words are reported by Photius in his Bibliotheca. So that, οὐδὲν ὑγιές, there is nothing of truth, no colour of probability, in this desperate figment.

40. Their last evasion is, that by "Messiah the Prince," the office

of magistracy and priesthood, and in them all anointed unto authority, are intended. These, they say, were to be cut off in the destruction of the city. And herein they have the consent of Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, among the ancients, who are also followed by some later writers. But this evasion also is of the same nature with the former, yea, more vain than they, if any thing may be allowed so to be. The angel twice mentioneth the Messiah in his message;—first, his coming and anointing, Dan. ix. 25; and then his cutting off, verse 26. If the same person or thing be not intended in both places, the whole discourse is equivocal and unintelligible, no circumstance being added to difference between them who are called by the same name in the same place. And to suppose that the Holy Ghost by one and the same name, within a few words, continuing his speech of the same matter without any note of difference or distinction, should signify things diverse from one another, is to leave no place for the understanding of any thing that is spoken by him. The Messiah, therefore, who was to come, and be anointed, and cut off, is one and the same individual person. Now, it is expressly said that there shall be seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks,—that is, four hundred and eighty-three years,—"from the going forth of the decree unto Messiah the Prince." I desire, therefore, to know whether that space of time was past before they had any such magistrates or priests as they pretend afterwards were cut off. This is so far from truth, that before that time the rule of the Asmonæans, the last supreme magistrates of their own nation, was put to an end. This pretence, therefore, may pass with the former. And this perplexity of the modern Jews, in their attempts to apply this prophecy unto any other thing or person besides the true Messiah, confirms our exposition and application of it. There is no other person that they can imagine unto whom any *one* thing here mentioned may seem to belong, much less can they think of any in whom they should *all* centre and agree. It is, then, the promised Messiah, the hope and expectation of the fathers, whose coming and cutting off are here foretold

41. *Secondly*, That which remains for the full confirmation of our argument from this place is, that, according unto this prophecy, the promised Messiah was to come whilst the temple was standing and the daily sacrifice continued, before the expiration of the seventy weeks of years limited by the angel. This is put beyond all question in the text itself, nor is it denied by the Jews, all whose exceptions lie against the person spoken of, whom we have proved to be the Messiah. Seventy weeks are assigned by the angel for the accomplishment of the whole prophecy and all things contained in it. After seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks,—that is, in the beginning or middle of the last week,—the Messiah was to be cut off.

When this was past, and *the covenant confirmed* with many, unto the expiration of the whole time limited, the daily sacrifice was to cease, and an overflowing desolation was to come upon the city and temple. This the Jews themselves acknowledge to be the destruction brought upon them by the Romans, nor do any of them extend the four hundred and ninety years any farther. It remains, therefore, that the Messiah came before that desolation; which is that we undertook to demonstrate from this place.

42. There are yet some arguments that remain, to the same purpose with those foregoing; but before we proceed unto them, it will be necessary to consider the computation of the times, which we are here directed unto by the angel. I have already manifested that our argument from this place is not concerned in the exact chronological computation of the time here limited, as to its precise beginning and ending, with the commensuration of it unto the times, seasons, and accounts of the nations of the world; for whenever the time mentioned began, all men agree that it is long since expired, namely, at or before the desolation of the city and temple. Now, all that we undertook to prove, which also is sufficient unto our present purpose, is, that before that season the Messiah was to come and to be cut off; which we have done, and cleared our argument from all further concernment in this account. But yet, that it may appear that there is no entanglement cast upon this testimony by the chronological difficulties which are pretended in the computation of the time here determined, as also that there are no such difficulties therein but what are fairly reconcilable unto all that is affirmed in the text, before we proceed to the consideration of our remaining arguments, they also shall be considered and stated in the ensuing Exercitation.

EXERCITATION XV.

COMPUTATION OF DANIEL'S WEEKS.

1. Chronological computation of the times determined in Daniel's weeks—Difficulty thereof acknowledged. 2. Beginning before the reign of Cyrus rejected. 3. Double beginning of the kingdom of Cyrus; that over Persia; that over the Babylonian monarchy. 4. Foreign accounts to be suited unto the Scripture. 5. Beginning of the reign of Cyrus over Persia, when; over the whole empire, when—The space of time from thence to the destruction of Jerusalem five hundred and ninety-nine years. 6. Duration of the Persian empire; of the empire of the Seleucidæ, to the rule of Jonathan among the Jews. 7. Duration of the Egyptian kingdom, or reign of the Ptolemies. 8. Rule of the Asmonæans and Herod the Great—From the birth of Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem. 9. From the first decree of Cyrus to the destruction of Jerusalem, five hundred and ninety-nine years. 10. Precise end of Daniel's weeks, the death of the Messiah. 11. Thirty-

seven years taken from the former account—Opinion of Reynolds; 12. Examined and rejected—Meaning of נֶחְתַּךְ, "cut off;" limited, not abbreviated—Vulgar Latin and Montague noted. 13. Opinion of the Jews rejected. 14. Account of Beroaldus, Broughton, Genebrard, Willet—The decree of Cyrus not intended in the prophecy. 15. Of the life and age of Nehemiah—He came not up with Zerubbabel. 16. Another decree than that of Cyrus must be sought. 17. The decree of Darius—What Darius that was—Hystaspes—Not the decree intended. 18, 19. This Darius not Nothus; proved against Scaliger. 20. The decrees of Artaxerxes to Ezra and Nehemiah examined. 21. Longimanus, not Memor, intended. 22. Decree unto Ezra proved to be the decree mentioned.

1. THIRDLY,[1] THAT there is some difficulty in finding out the true and exact computation of the time here limited all chronologers and expositors do confess; neither is there any thing that belongs unto the account of the times mentioned in the Scripture that hath been debated of old or of late with more difference of opinion or diligence of endeavour. And the Holy Ghost himself by the angel seems to intimate this difficulty unto Daniel in the double caution given him about it in the preface of the revelation made unto him, chap. ix. 23, בִּין בַּדָּבָר, and וְהָבֵן בַּמַּרְאֶה, declaring that not ordinary wisdom, diligence, consideration, and understanding, are to be used in the investigation of the time here determined; nor is it necessary to suppose that Daniel himself exactly understood the beginning and ending of the time or weeks mentioned. The hiding of the precise time intended was also greatly subservient unto the providence of God, in the work he had to do by the Messiah, and what the people were to do unto him. The general notation of it sufficed for the direction of the godly and the conviction of unbelievers; as it doth unto this day. And it may be we shall not find any computation that will exactly answer in all particulars and fractions to a day, month, or year; and that either because of the great darkness and confusion of some of the times falling under the account, or else because perhaps it was not the mind of God that ever the time should be so precisely calculated, or that any thing which he revealed for the strengthening of the faith of his church should depend on chronological niceties. It shall suffice us, then, to propose and confirm such an account of these weeks, which, infallibly comprising the substance of the prophecy, contains nothing in it contrary to the Scripture, and is not liable unto any just and rational exception. And herein I shall not examine all the several accounts and computations that by learned men of old or of late have been given (being eleven or twelve in number), but only mention those which carry the fairest probability, and the greatness of whose authors or abettors calls for our consideration.

2. In the first place, we may wholly lay aside the consideration of

[1] See for the division to which this numeral belongs, page 316.—ED.

them who would date the weeks from any time whatever before the first year of the reign and first decree of Cyrus. Among these are Lyra, Brugensis, Galatinus, and he from whom he borrowed his computation, Raymundus Martini. These fix the beginning of the weeks on the fourth year of Zedekiah, as they say, when Jeremiah gave out his prophecy about the Babylonish captivity, and the return from it at the end of seventy years; indeed the fourth year of Jehoiakim, and not of Zedekiah, as is apparent, Jer. xxv. 1, 11. Of the like nature is the account of Solomon Jarchi among the Jews, who dates the time limited from the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans. But both these accounts are expressly contrary to the words of the angel, fixing the beginning of the time designed on the *going forth of a decree for the building of Jerusalem.* To these we may add all that would extend these weeks beyond the destruction of the city and temple by Titus, as some of the Jews would do, to comprise the prophecy of their second fatal destruction by Hadrian, which is no way concerned in it.

3. The *seventy weeks* mentioned, then, we must seek for between the *first year* of Cyrus, when the first decree was made for the re-edification of the temple, and the *final destruction* of it by the Romans. This space we are confined unto by the text. The seventy weeks are מִן־מֹצָא דָבָר לְהָשִׁיב וְלִבְנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלִַם,—"from the going forth of the word to cause to return and build Jerusalem," verse 25. Now the kingdom of Cyrus had a *double first year,*—the one absolutely of his reign over Persia, the other of his rule over the Babylonish monarchy, which he had conquered after the death of Darius Medus. The first year it is of this second date of the kingdom of Cyrus which may have any relation unto the time here limited; for whilst he was king of Persia only, he could have nothing to do with the Jews, nor make any decree for the building of the temple, both the people and place being then under the dominion of another. Besides, Ezra i. 1, 2, where it is said that he made his decree in the *first year* of his reign, himself plainly declares that he had obtained the *eastern monarchy,* by the conquest of Babylon: "The LORD God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth;" which words can in no sense be applied unto the kingdom of Persia, supposing the monarchy of Babylon still to continue. The whole space of time, then, here limited is seventy weeks, Dan. ix. 24. The beginning of these seventy weeks is "the going forth of the decree" (or "word") "to restore and to build Jerusalem," verse 25. The first decree or command that could have any relation unto this matter was that made by Cyrus in the first year of his empire. We must, then, in the first place, find out the direct space of time *between the first year of Cyrus and the destruction of the temple,* and then inquire whether the whole, or what part of it, is denoted by these seventy weeks.

4. Some, I confess, there are who contend that there is no consideration to be had of that computation of time which we find amongst the heathen writers, nor of those stated epochs by which they limited and distinguished their computations; for whereas, say they, we have certainly the term of this duration of time, its beginning and ending fixed,—namely, the *first of Cyrus* and the *death of the Messiah*, —it is positively determined that between them were seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, unto which all other accounts are to be squared and made proportionable. Indeed, the conclusion were unquestionable, if the premises were certain. If the terms be rightly fixed in the *first of Cyrus* and the *death of the Messiah*, there must be but four hundred and ninety years between them; for, whether we understand the reason of it or no, all foreign accounts must be suited unto what of *infallible truth* is stated in the Scripture.

But these things are much questioned. For whereas some do doubt whether the time limited do absolutely expire in the death of the Messiah, and be not rather to be extended unto the destruction of the city and temple, there be many more that do peremptorily deny that it is to take date from the *first decree of Cyrus*. And so must we also, unless it can be proved that the times mentioned are justly commensurate from thence unto the death of the Messiah; for seeing there were *other decrees*, as we shall find, to the same purpose, which might be respected as well as that, there is no reason why we should offer violence unto other approved computations, to force them to submit unto the Scripture account, when we first offer violence unto that to make it serve our own opinion. I shall therefore proceed in the way proposed, and first give a just computation of the time from the first year of the empire of Cyrus unto the destruction of the city and temple; and then inquire whether the seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, here determined, be commensurate unto the *whole*, or only unto some *part* of it; and if to *some part* only, then to what part of it; and how we are directed by the text to the beginning and end of the computation.

And herein I shall not scrupulously bind myself unto days, or months, or seasons of the year, in any single account, but only consider the full and round number of years, which in such computations, according to the custom of holy writ, is to be observed. And indeed, what through the silence, what through the disagreement, of ancient historians, it is utterly impossible to state exactly, as to those lesser fractions, the times that are past of old; and we seek for no more certainty in these things than the condition of them will naturally bear.

5. It is generally agreed by all historians and chronologers that Cyrus began his reign over Persia in the first year of the fifty-fifth Olympiad; probably the same year that Nabonidas or Darius Medus

began his reign over Babylon. And this was the year wherein Daniel set himself solemnly to seek the Lord for the delivery of the people out of captivity, he being now come to a kingdom who was so long before prophesied of to be their deliverer, Dan. ix. 1–3. In the twenty-seventh year of his reign, or the first of the sixty-second Olympiad, having conquered the Babylonian empire, he began the first year of his monarchical reign, from whence Daniel reckons his third, which was his last, chap. x. 1; and therein he proclaimed liberty unto the people of the Jews to return to Jerusalem, and to build the temple, Ezra i. 1. The city and temple were destroyed by Titus in the third year of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad. Now, from the first year of the sixty-second Olympiad unto the third of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad, inclusive, are five hundred and ninety-nine years; and within that space of time are we to inquire after and find the four hundred and ninety years here prophesied of and foretold.

6. Of this space of time, the Persian empire, from the twenty-seventh of Cyrus, or first of the whole monarchy, and the first of the sixty-second Olympiad, continued two hundred and two years, as is generally acknowledged by all ancient historians, ending on and including in it the second year of the one hundred and twelfth Olympiad, which was the last of Darius Codomannus. For Cyrus reigned after this three years; Cambyses and Smerdis Magus, eight; Darius Hystaspes, thirty-four; Xerxes, with the months ensuing of Artabanus, twenty-one; Artaxerxes Longimanus, forty-one; Darius Nothus, nineteen; Artaxerxes Mnemon, forty-three; Ochus, twenty-three; Arses, three; Darius Codomannus, seven. In all, two hundred and two years.

After his death, Alexander, beginning his reign in the third year of the one hundred and twelfth Olympiad, reigned six years. From him there is a double account, by the two most famous branches of the Grecian empire. The first is by the Syrian, or era of the Seleucidæ, which takes its date from the tenth year after the death of Alexander, when, after some bloody contests, Seleucus settled his kingdom in Syria, and reigned thirty years. After him reigned Antiochus Soter, twenty-one years; Antiochus Theos, fifteen; Seleucus Callinicus, twenty; Seleucus Ceraunus, two; Antiochus Magnus, thirty-seven; Seleucus Philopator, twelve; Antiochus Epiphanes, twelve; Eupator, two; Demetrius Soter, ten. In the second year of this Demetrius, which was the one hundred and fifty-third of the account of the Seleucidæ, was Judas Maccabæus slain, being the one hundred and sixty-ninth year after the death of Darius Codomannus, or end of the Persian empire, allowing six years to the reign of Alexander, and ten more to the beginning of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ. Demetrius Soter, in the tenth year of his reign, was

expelled out of his kingdom by Alexander Vales [Balas]; in the second year of whose reign, ten years after the death of Judas, Jonathan his brother took upon him the supreme government of the people of the Jews, and began the rule or reign of the Asmonæans. So that the time of the Grecian empire in Syria, from the death of Darius Codomannus unto the liberty of the Jews and erection of a supreme government amongst them, was one hundred and seventy-nine years; which, being added unto two hundred and two years of the Persian empire, makes up three hundred and eighty-one years.

7. To the same issue comes also the account by the other branch of the Grecian empire in Egypt: for Alexander reigned, as we said, after the death of Darius, six years; Ptolemæus Lagus, thirty-nine; Philadelphus, thirty-eight; Euergetes, twenty-four; Philopator, nineteen; Epiphanes, twenty-three; Philometor, thirty, in which thirtieth year began the rule of the Asmonæans.

8. The rule of the Asmonæans, with the reign of Herod the Great, who obtained the kingdom by means of their divisions, continued until the birth of Christ, one hundred and forty-eight years: for Jonathan began his rule in the second year of the one hundred and fifty-seventh Olympiad, as may be seen by adding the Seleucian era to the one hundred and fourteenth Olympiad, wherein Alexander died; and our Lord Christ was born in the second year of the one hundred and ninety-fourth Olympiad, in the last year, or the last save one, of Herod the Great. This sum of one hundred and forty-eight years being added to the fore-mentioned, from the beginning of the empire of Cyrus, which is three hundred and eighty-one years, makes up in all five hundred and twenty-nine years. From the birth of our Lord Christ, in the second year of the one hundred and ninety-fourth Olympiad, to the destruction of the city and temple, in the third year of the two hundred and eleventh Olympiad, are seventy years; which make up the whole sum before mentioned of five hundred and ninety-nine years, from the first of the empire of Cyrus unto the destruction of Jerusalem. Petavius and our Montague reckon from the first of Cyrus unto the eighteenth of Tiberius, wherein our Lord Christ suffered, five hundred and ninety-four years, which differs very little from the account we have insisted on; for take from them twenty-seven years of the reign of Cyrus before the first of his empire, and add unto them thirty-seven for the continuance of the city and temple after the death of Christ, and the sum remaining will exceed our account only four years, or five at the most. But the computation we have fixed on being every way consistent with itself and the stated eras of the nations, and abridging the time to the shortest size that will endure the trial, we shall abide by it. Now, the number of five hundred and

ninety-nine years exceeds the time limited in this prophecy, of four hundred and ninety, the whole space of one hundred and nine years.

9. Hence it evidently appears that the seventy weeks of Gabriel, or the four hundred and ninety years, are not commensurate to the whole space of time between the first decree of Cyrus, in the first year of his general empire, and the final desolation of city and temple by Titus. One hundred and nine years must be taken from it, either at the beginning or at the ending, or partly at the one, partly at the other.

10. We shall first consider the *end* of them, which, being clear in the prophecy, will regulate, fix, and state the beginning. Two things in general are insisted on in this prophecy:—first, The coming of Messiah the Prince, his anointing unto the work which he had to do, and his cutting off, as we before declared; secondly, The ceasing of the daily sacrifice, with the destruction of the city and temple by war and a flood of desolations. Now, these things happened not at the same time, for the city and sanctuary were destroyed thirty-seven years after the cutting off or death of the Messiah. We are to inquire, therefore, which of these it was that the time mentioned was determined for and was to expire withal. Now, it is the coming, anointing, and cutting off of the Messiah that is the thing chiefly intended in this prophecy. This we have proved undeniably before, manifesting that the *vision* was granted unto Daniel, and given out by him, for the consolation of himself and the church, as was the way of the Holy Ghost in all his dealings with the fathers of old. Hereunto the desolation and destruction of the city and temple was only a consequent, a thing that should follow and ensue on what was principally foretold and promised. And, [First,] It is doubtless unreasonable to extend the duration of the time beyond the principal subject-matter treated of, and on the account whereof alone the computation is granted, unto that which is only *occasionally* mentioned as the consequent of the accomplishment of the prophecy itself. Besides, [Secondly,] The computation itself is pointed directly by the angel unto the Messiah and his cutting off: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people. Know therefore that from the going forth of the commandment unto Messiah the Prince shall be," etc. "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." But there is no guidance or direction of the time limited unto the desolation of the city and sanctuary, which is only said to ensue thereon. Thirdly, It is expressly said that the time limited extends itself only unto the death of the Messiah, or a very few years further; for he was to come after seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, which are the whole time limited within one week, or seven, of years. Now, his coming here intended is not his *incarnation*, but the time

of his *unction in his baptism*, which fell out at the end of sixty-nine weeks. After these sixty-nine weeks, or seven and sixty-two, he is to be cut off,—that is, in the middle or towards the end of the last week,—when he had confirmed the covenant by preaching three years and a half of that seven years which remained. And if we shall say that his unction being to be after the seven weeks and sixty-two, we must grant it to be in the first or second year of the last week, whereunto add the three years and a half of his preaching, the remnant fraction of one year or two can no way disturb the account, there being nothing more frequent than the casting in of such parcels of time to complete and fill up an entire and round number. Here, then, must we fix the end of the four hundred and ninety years, in the death of the Messiah; and so wholly lay aside the account of them who would extend the time determined unto the desolation of the city and temple.

11. We must, therefore, in the first place, abate from the whole account of five hundred and ninety-nine years, before stated, the sum of thirty-seven years, which ensued after the death of our Saviour until the destruction of Jerusalem; and the remnant is five hundred and sixty-two years. Now, five hundred and sixty-two years exceed the number of four hundred and ninety stated in Daniel's vision by seventy-two years. It appears, then, that the beginning and ending of the seventy weeks cannot be the decree of Cyrus and the death of our Saviour, there being seventy-two years between them more than the weeks contain or can be extended unto. The end we have already fixed from the text, and therefore it doth not appear that their date and rise can be taken from the decree of Cyrus. Sundry things are offered to disentangle us from this difficulty.

The most learned Reynolds, in his prelections on the apocryphal books, allowing our account above mentioned, as to the substance of it, especially that which concerneth the Persian empire, about which alone there is any considerable difference, yet resolves at length that the number of seventy weeks, which is a round complete number, is put for an uncertain number, thereabouts, more or less, over or under, not much varying from it. And on this supposition, he dates the beginning of the weeks in the decree of Cyrus. To confirm his opinion, he giveth sundry instances of this kind of computation in the Scripture, and contends that the particular reason of limiting the whole time unto seventy weeks, was to make it answer unto the seventy years' captivity that immediately preceded it, the time to follow being declared to be just seven times as much.

12. This interpretation of the words, might it be admitted, would, I confess, solve all difficulties, and entirely preserve the sacred and

profane accounts from all appearance of interfering. But there are two reasons upon the account whereof I cannot assent unto it. The first is, Because indeed there is no other instance in the Scripture to give countenance unto it, namely, wherein a number of years coming so far short of the true and exact account as this doth is yet put for the whole, especially considering this number is given out for this very purpose, that men might aright compute it, and so come to know the time of its expiration. But to name four hundred and ninety for five hundred and sixty-two seems rather to be a conjecture than a prophecy. This may be the condition, then, of some few *odd* years that may be cast in unto a full round number, but, of so considerable a part of the whole as seventy-two is, there is no reason to suppose it so disposed of. Secondly, The word used by the angel to express the limitation of this time, נְחְתַּךְ, plainly proves that a *precise duration* of time and number of years is signified. The Vulgar Latin renders that word "abbreviatæ," "shortened," or cut short; and a learned man of our own approves of that interpretation of it, in opposition unto our own translation and that of Junius. "De annis," saith he, "porro loquitur signanter propheta quod sint, non decisi" (as Junius), "non 'determinati'" (as ours), "apud Deum statuti (quod tamen verum erat), sed quod erant 'abbreviati' quemadmodum transtulit doctissimus interpres vetus," Mon. App. ad Orig. Eccl., and thereon disputes at large how the years are said to be "shortened;" and yet concludes, "Dicuntur autem abbreviatæ hebdomadæ, eo quod erant decisæ et determinatæ;" as though "shortened" or "abbreviated" were the proper sense of the word, only it might be interpreted "determined," or that the days are said to be *shortened* because they were *determined.* But the truth is, חָתַךְ doth not signify "to abbreviate" or make short, and all the reasons given to show why the times here are said to be shortened are perfectly cast away. It is in this place only used in the Scripture, and that in the singular number, joined with a noun of the plural, to intimate that every week of the whole number was limited, and determined, and cut out; as is usual in the Hebrew. Among the rabbins it is "to cut off," and from it is חתיכה, "a piece cut off;" as, חתיכה של בשר, "a piece of flesh cut off;" and חתך is "a cutting," or incision. So that the word in its precise signification is "cut out," or "cut off," that is, set apart, limited, or determined,—a portion of time "cut out," limited, and apportioned unto the end, for the accomplishment of the work foretold. Now, there is nothing more contrary unto a precise determination of time than that a *certain* number of years should be named to signify an *uncertain,* and that so exceeding distant from the exact account as four hundred and ninety years are from five hundred and sixty-two. So that here is no place for the conjecture of that most learned and renowned person.

13. The Jews take another course to solve this difficulty, as also to give some countenance unto their computation in dating the weeks from the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and ending them in the desolation of the second house by the Romans; for they will allow no more kings of Persia than are mentioned in the Scripture, nor that they reigned any longer than they find mention therein of the years of their reign; as though, whether they did good or evil towards Jerusalem, it was fatal unto them, so that they must needs die immediately upon it. Thus they allow not above four or five kings of Persia at most, and thereby take in the duration of that empire from two hundred years and upwards unto fifty years at the most! But this supposition stands in open contradiction to all generally-allowed computations of time in the world; and not only so, but it excludes all consideration of things done, as notorious to mankind as that ever there was such a thing as the Persian empire. Of this nature are the transactions and wars with other nations, especially the Grecians, which fell not out in the days of any of the kings mentioned in the Scripture, especially that famous expedition of Xerxes, which the whole world looked on, and waited for its event. And yet I acknowledge that this imagination might deserve consideration, could it be pretended that the books of Ezra and Nehemiah did intentionally give us an account and history of the Persian empire, and the reign of the kings thereof, as some books do of the kings of Israel and Judah. But whereas it is evident that their design is quite otherwise, and that they only *occasionally* mention *some* of the kings of Persia, and *some years* of their reign, as they related unto the state and actions of the people of the Jews, it is no less madness and folly to contend from thence that there were no more kings of Persia than are mentioned in them, and that they reigned no longer than is in them expressed, than it would be to say that there were never above three or four kings of the Assyrian empire, because there are no more mentioned in the Scripture, and so many of them are spoken of. This ἀνιστορησία is beneath all consideration.

14. Others there are, men learned and pious, who, resolving to date these weeks from the first of Cyrus, and to make four hundred and ninety years the exact measure of the time from thence unto the death of the Messiah, and not being able to disprove the computation from Alexander unto that time, fall also upon the Persian empire, and cut it short above fifty years of the true account of its duration, to fit it unto the place and measure provided for it. To this end they reject the accounts of the Chaldeans, Grecians, and Romans, concerning the time of its continuance, as fabulous, and give us a new, arbitrary account of the reign of those kings whom they will allow.

This course steers Beroaldus, Broughton, Genebrard, and Willet, with sundry others. And the truth is, were the supposition once cleared, that the decree or commandment mentioned by Gabriel must needs be given out by Cyrus, there were some colour for offering of this violence unto all *consent of time*, with accounts of things done, though written by men prudent and sober in their own days. But this is so far from being a basis or foundation sufficient to warrant such a procedure, that take it nakedly of itself, without the burden upon it, and it is destitute of all probability. The *word*, decree, or commandment, mentioned unto Daniel, is that for the building of Jerusalem; that is, the *restoring* of it into a condition of rule and government; that is, the building of a city, and not only the setting up of houses. Consequent unto this, their *building of the walls* also for the defence of the people is mentioned. Of this it is said that it should fall out in a *troublesome time*, or a time of straits; as accordingly it did fall out, in the days of Nehemiah. In the whole there is not the least mention of building the temple, which, had it been intended, could not, I suppose, have been omitted. But in the decree of Cyrus, the principal thing mentioned and aimed at is the re-edification of the temple, the city and the walls thereof being not spoken of in it; as may be seen in the first of Ezra at large.

It seems evident, then, that the decree mentioned by Daniel for the building of the city and walls, and not the temple, and that given out by Cyrus for the building of the temple, and not the city and walls, were diverse. Besides, this decree of Cyrus, although foretold long before, and made famous because it was the entrance into the people's return and settlement, yet took effect for so short a space of time, being obstructed within less than three years, and utterly frustrated within four or five, that it is not likely to be the date of this prophecy, which seems to take place from some good settlement of the people. That alone which is pleaded with any colour for this decree of Cyrus is the prediction recorded, Isa. xliv. 28. It is prophesied of him, that he should "say to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." But yet neither is it here foretold that Cyrus should make any decree for the building of Jerusalem, nor that it should be done in his days; and, indeed, it was not until *an hundred years* after, as is evident from the story in Nehemiah. The whole intention of this prophecy is only that he should cause the people to be set at liberty from their captivity, and give them leave to return to Jerusalem; which he did accordingly, and thereupon both the building of the city and temple ensued, though not without the intervention of other decrees; of which afterwards.

15. The only argument wherewith this opinion of the duration of

the Persian empire, [as] not above one hundred and fifty years at the most, maintains itself, is taken from the life and age of Nehemiah. In Ezra ii. 2 he is reckoned among them that came up with Zerubbabel unto Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus. Then he may rationally be supposed to have been at least twenty or twenty-five years of age. And it seems, from the last chapter of Nehemiah, that he lived unto the reign of Darius Codomannus: for Sanballat the Horonite assisted Alexander in his wars; and Jaddua, whom he mentions chap. xii. 11, was high priest when Alexander came to Jerusalem, as appears from Josephus. Now, if the Persian empire continued for the space of two hundred years, which we have allotted unto it, then he who went to Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus, and continued unto the reign of Codomannus, must needs live two hundred and twenty years at the least, which is not credible that any one should do in those days; and therefore the space of time must needs be shorter than is pretended by at least fifty or sixty years.

But, indeed, there is no force in this exception: for,—First, There is no necessity why we should conclude that Nehemiah wrote that genealogy, chap. xii., where mention is made of Jaddua, who was afterwards high priest, verse 11; for he ends his story in the high-priesthood of Eliashib, chap. xiii. 28, who was great grandfather unto Jaddua, as appears chap. xii. 10, 11. Or, however, if he did, Jaddua might then be a child, and, it may be, not come unto the high-priesthood until fifty or sixty years after, after the death of Eliashib, Joiada, and Jonathan, his great grandfather, grandfather, and father. So that no evidence can be taken from hence for the continuance of his life unto the end of the Persian monarchy. And for that Sanballat mentioned by Josephus in the time of Alexander, it is not improbable but that he might name him as the head of the Samaritans, there being no name of any other after him left upon record. Secondly, There is no reason to think that the Nehemiah mentioned, Ezra ii. 2, who came up with Zerubbabel, was that Nehemiah who was afterwards governor of Judah, and whose actions we have written probably the most part by himself, no more than there is to think that the Seraiah there mentioned was the Seraiah that was slain at the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The Daniel mentioned, Ezra viii. 2, was not Daniel the prophet; nor Baruch, Neh. x. 6, that Baruch who was the scribe of Jeremiah; nor that Jeremiah mentioned, Neh. xii. 12, Jeremiah the prophet. Besides, Ezra is said to come up with Zerubbabel, Neh. xii. 1, which either must not be that Ezra the great scribe, or he must be said to come up with Zerubbabel, because he followed him on the same errand and account. It cannot be denied but that there were sundry men at the same time of the same name. As the same person had

sundry names, much more might several men have the same name in successive generations. Thus, after Joshua was high priest, there was another Joshua chief of the Levites, Neh. xii. 7, 8. And that about this time there were two Zerubbabels,—one of the house of Nathan, the other of the posterity of Solomon,—we shall make it appear, in the consideration of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. Thirdly, That this was not the Nehemiah that went up with Zerubbabel, the sacred story itself gives us sufficient evidence; for,—(1.) He was ignorant of the state and condition of Jerusalem when he lived in the court of Persia, chap. i. Had he been there before and seen their condition, and but newly returned unto Shushan, he could not have been so surprised as he was, verse 4, upon the account then given him thereof. (2.) Chap. vii. 5, 6, he speaks of it as a great matter that he should find a roll or register of them that came first up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel in the days of Cyrus, amongst whom that Nehemiah was one. Now, if this had been himself, what reason had he to mention it as a great discovery, which he could not but by his own knowledge be full well acquainted withal? Unto what time soever, then, the period of his life was extended, there is no colour to surmise that he was amongst them who returned from captivity in the days of Cyrus.

16. The account, therefore, before laid down being established, it is certain enough that the decree mentioned by Gabriel, from the going forth whereof the seventy weeks are to be dated, was not that of the first of Cyrus for the return of the captivity and building of the temple; for from thence the period would issue long before the just time allotted unto it, yea, before the beginning of the reign of Herod the Great, where Eusebius would have it to expire. We must therefore inquire for some other word, decree, or commandment, from whence to date the four hundred and ninety years inquired after.

17. The second decree of the kings of Persia in reference unto the Jews was that of Darius, made in his second year, when the work of the building of the temple was carried on through the prophecy of Haggai and Zechariah. This is the decree or commandment mentioned in Ezra vi., granted by Darius, upon appeal made unto him from the neighbouring governors; and it was a mere revival of the decree of Cyrus, the roll whereof was found in Achmetha, in the province of the Medes, verse 2. And this is that which Haggai and Zechariah relate unto, dating their prophecies from the second year of Darius, Hag. i. 2, 15; Zech. i. 1. Upon the roll of the kings of Persia we find three called by the name of Darius, or Darianes, as the Jews term him:—(1.) Darius Hystaspes, who succeeded Cambyses, by the election of the princes of Persia, upon the killing of Smerdis Magus the usurper. (2.) Darius Nothus, who

succeeded Artaxerxes Longimanus; (3.) Darius Codomannus, in whom the Persian empire had its period by Alexander the Great. That the last of these can be no way concerned in the decree is notorious. The two others are disputed. Most learned men grant that it was Darius Hystaspes which was the author of this decree; and indeed that it was so, at least that it can be ascribed unto no other Darius, we shall afterwards undeniably prove. And it is not unlikely that he was inclined unto this favour and moderation towards the Jews by his general design to relieve men from under the oppressions that were upon them during the reign of Cambyses, and to renew the acts of Cyrus their first emperor, who was renowned amongst them, to ingratiate himself unto mankind, and confirm himself in that kingdom whereunto he came not by succession. And it is not improbable but that this was he who was the husband of Esther; though if so, it was not until after this decree made in the second year of his reign, the putting away of Vashti happening in his third, Esth. i. 3. Now, Cyrus reigned after his first decree three years; Cambyses with Smerdis, eight; whom succeeded this Darius, who issued out this decree in the second year of his reign,—that is, at most, thirteen years after the decree of Cyrus; or if with some we should grant Cyrus to have reigned twenty years over the whole empire, it was but nineteen or twenty years at the most. Now, the whole sum of years from the first of Cyrus to the cutting off of the Messiah, we have manifested to have been five hundred and sixty-two. Deduct thirteen years from five hundred and sixty-two, and there yet remain five hundred and forty-nine years, which exceed the number of years inquired after fifty-nine years. Neither doth the addition of seven years to the reign of Cyrus make any alteration in this general account; for on that supposition, his first year must be taken seven years backwards, and the space of time from thence unto the end of the weeks will be five hundred and sixty-nine years, and the remnant from Darius, as we declared before, five hundred and forty-nine years. So that neither can this be the commandment intended, there being from the going forth of it unto the cutting off of the Messiah, not four hundred and ninety years, but, as is declared, five hundred and forty-nine. Besides, indeed, this decree of Darius was no new command, nor had any respect unto the restoration of Jerusalem, but was a mere renovation or a new acknowledgment of the decree of Cyrus about the re-edifying of the temple; and so, doubtless, was not designed as the signal epoch of the time here limited and determined.

18. The great Scaliger, who would date the weeks from this decree of Darius, knowing that the time would not suit with the reign of Darius Hystaspes, contends that it was Nothus, who succeeded Longimanus, that was the author of it, and extends the whole time or space of four hundred and ninety years to the destruction of the

city and temple, that space of time, according to his computation, being elapsed from the second year of Darius.

But the truth is, as may be seen from our former account, from the second year of Darius Nothus to the destruction of the city was but four hundred and eighty years, [being] short of the whole sum. Besides, we have before proved from the text that the time determined was to expire in the death of the Messiah. And there are sundry other circumstances which plainly evince the inconsistency of this computation; for from the first of Cyrus, when the first command went forth for the building of the temple, whereupon the work of it was begun, unto the second year of Nothus, are fully an hundred and eight years. And it is not credible that the work of building the temple should so long be hindered, and then come to perfection by them who first began it; for on this supposition Zerubbabel and Joshua must live at Jerusalem after their return above an hundred years, and then take in hand again the work which they had so long deserted. And this is yet more incredible upon his own opinion, that Xerxes was the husband of Esther, about fifty years before the reign of Nothus, when it is not likely but the Jews would have attempted, and not have been denied, their liberty of going on with their work.

Neither is it consistent with the prophecy of Jeremiah that the temple should lie waste so long a space, that is, about a hundred and seventy years. Again, Haggai doth plainly declare that when the work of the temple was carrying on, in the second year of Darius, many were yet alive who had seen the first temple, chap. ii. 3, as multitudes were upon the laying of its foundation in the days of Cyrus, Ezra iii. 12. And this was impossible had it been in the days of Nothus, an hundred and sixty, or an hundred and seventy years after it was destroyed. And Scaliger doth plainly wrest the words of the text, when he would have them pronounced by way of supposition, "If any were then alive who saw the first house in its glory;" for Haggai doth plainly relate unto the distemper of the people upon the laying of the foundation of the house mentioned in the forenamed place of Ezra. And the words themselves will bear no other sense: מִי בָכֶם הַנִּשְׁאָר אֲשֶׁר רָאָה אֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה בְּכְבוֹדוֹ;—"Who is among you that is left, that saw this house in her glory?" He speaks of them who were *yet left* and remaining; and spake to them to remove and take away their complaint and repinings. Moreover, that Artaxerxes in whose days Ezra and Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem was Longimanus, who reigned before Nothus, and not Memor, who succeeded him, as will afterwards appear. Now, this Artaxerxes was long after that Darius upon whose warranty the building of the temple was finished, Ezra vii. 1, 11–26, which certainly could not be Nothus, who was his successor.

19. It appears, then, that Darius Nothus was not the author of

the decree mentioned; as also, that the times of the weeks cannot be dated from the second year of Darius Hystaspes, who was the author of it.

20. After this there is mention made of two other commands or decrees relating to the temple and people, both granted by the same Artaxerxes,—one in the seventh year of his reign, unto Ezra, chap. vii. 7; the other in the twentieth year of his reign, unto Nehemiah, chap. ii. 1–9. And from one of these must the account inquired after be dated. Now, supposing that one of these decrees must be intended, it is evident that it was Longimanus, and not Memor, who was the author of it; for from the seventh year of Memor, which was the second of the ninety-fifth Olympiad, unto the eighteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, wherein our Saviour suffered, being the third year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, are only four hundred and twenty-eight years, sixty-two years short of the whole, or four hundred and ninety. Now, these sixty-two years added to the beginning of the account from the seventh of Memor fall in exactly on the seventh of Longimanus. From the seventh of Longimanus, then, to the seventh of Memor are sixty-two years, and from the seventh of Memor to the eighteenth of Tiberius are four hundred and twenty-eight years; in the whole, four hundred and ninety,—the whole number inquired after.

21. It was this decree of Longimanus, then, that was intended by the angel Gabriel; for from the seventh year, wherein he sent Ezra unto Jerusalem, unto that work which he afterwards commissionated Nehemiah to carry on and perfect, unto the cutting off of the Messiah, are exactly *seventy weeks*, or four hundred and ninety years, as may appear from the accounts formerly insisted on and declared. From the first of Cyrus, supposing him to reign but three years over the whole empire, unto the death of Christ, there were, as we have proved, five hundred and sixty-two years. From the first of the same Cyrus, unto the seventh of Longimanus, were seventy-two years, which being deducted from the whole of five hundred and sixty-two years, the remainder is four hundred and ninety; which space of time, how it was apportioned between the Persian, Grecian, Asmonæan, Herodian, and Roman rule, we have before declared.

22. And there wants not reason to induce us to fix on this decree rather than any other, being indeed the most famous and most useful to the people of all the rest. By what means it was obtained is not recorded. Evident it is that Ezra had great favour with the king, and that he had convinced him of the greatness and power of that God whom he served, chap. viii. 22. Besides, it was not a mere *proclamation of liberty*, like that of Cyrus, which was renewed by Darius, but a decree, a law, made by "the king and his seven counsellors," chap. vii. 14,—the highest and most irrefragable *legislative*

power amongst the Medes and Persians. Moreover, with the decree he had a formal *commission*, when he is said not only to have *leave to go*, but to be *sent by the king and his council*. Besides, the former decrees barely respected the *temple;* and it seems that in the execution of them the people had done little more than build the *bare fabric*, all things as to the true order of the worship of God remaining in great confusion, and the civil state utterly neglected. But now in this *commission* of Ezra, he is not only directed to set the whole worship of God in order, at the charge of the king, chap. vii. 16–23, but also that he should appoint and erect a *civil government* and magistracy, with supreme power over the lives, liberties, and estate of men, to be exercised as occasion required, verses 25, 26: which alone, and no other, was the *building of the city* mentioned by Gabriel; for it is not walls and houses, but polity, rule, and government, that makes and constitutes a city.

23. And it is very considerable what a conviction of the *necessity* of this work was then put upon the spirits of the governors of the Persian empire. For the king himself, he calls Ezra the "scribe of the law of the God of heaven," owning him therein for the true God; for he who is the God of heaven is God alone, all others are but the dunghill gods of the earth, verse 12. Again, he declares that he was persuaded that if this work were not done, there would be wrath from heaven upon himself, his kingdom, and his sons, verse 23. The "seven counsellors" join in that law, verse 14; and the "mighty princes" of the kingdom assisted Ezra in his work, verse 28. So that no command that concerned that people before or after was accompanied with such *solemnity*, or gave such glory unto God as this did. Besides, the whole work of the reformation of the church, the restitution of the worship of God, the re-collection and recognition of the sacred oracles, was begun, carried on, and finished, by this Ezra, as we have elsewhere at large declared. All which considerations, falling in with the account before insisted on, make it manifest that it was this and no other decree that was intended by the angel Gabriel; and from thence unto the death of the Messiah was seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, the just and true limitation of which time we have been inquiring after.

24. I declared at the entrance of this discourse, that the force of our argument from this place of Daniel against the Jews doth not depend on this *chronological computation* of the time determined. All then that I aimed at was to vindicate it in general from such perplexities as whereby they pretend to render the whole place inargumentative; and this we have not only done, but also so stated the account as that they are not able from any records of times past to lay any one considerable objection against it, or which may not be easily solved. Return we now to what remains of our former designed discourse.

EXERCITATION XVI.

JEWISH TRADITIONS ABOUT THE COMING OF THE MESSIAH.

1. Other considerations proving the Messiah to be long since come. 2. Fluctuation of the Jews about the person and work of the Messiah. 3. Their state and condition in the world for sixteen ages. 4. Promises of the covenant made with them of old all fulfilled, unto the expiration of that covenant. 5. Not now made good unto them—Reason thereof—The promise of the land of Canaan hath failed; 6. Of protection and temporal deliverance. 7. Spirit of prophecy departed. 8. Covenant expired. 9. Jewish exceptions—Their prosperity; 10. The sins of their forefathers; 11-13. Of themselves—Vanity of these exceptions—Concessions of the ancient Jews—Folly of Talmudical doctors. 14. Tradition of the birth of the Messiah before the destruction of the second temple. 15, 16. Tradition of the school of Elias about the world's continuance—Answers of the Jews unto our arguments, by way of concession. 17. The time prolonged because of their sins—Vanity of this pretence. 18. Not the Jews only, but the Gentiles concerned in the coming of the Messiah. 19. The promise not conditional—Limitations of time not capable of conditions. 20. No mention of any such condition. 21. The condition supposed overthrows the promise. 22. The Jews in the use of this plea self-condemned. 23. The covenant overthrown by it. 24. The Messiah may never come upon it.

1. Unto the invincible testimonies before insisted on, we may add some other considerations, taken from the Jews themselves, that are both suitable unto their conviction, and of use to strengthen the faith of them who do believe. And the first thing that offers itself unto us, is their miserable *fluctuation* and uncertainty in the whole doctrine about the Messiah, ever since the time of his coming and their rejection of him.

2. That the great fundamental of their profession from the days of Abraham, and that which all their worship was founded in and had respect unto, was the promise of the coming of the Messiah, we have before sufficiently proved. Until the time of his coming, this they were unanimous in, as also in their desires and expectations of his advent. Since that time, as they have utterly lost all faith in him as to the great end for which he was promised, so all truth as to the doctrine concerning his person, office, and work, plentifully delivered in the Old Testament.

In their Talmud Tractat. Sanhed. they do nothing but wrangle, conjecture, and contend about him, and that under such notions and apprehensions of him as the Scripture giveth no countenance unto. When he shall come, and how, where he shall be born, and what he shall do, they wrangle much about, but are not able to determine any thing at all; at which uncertainty the Holy Ghost never left the church in things of so great importance. Hence some of them adhered to Bar-Cosba for the Messiah, a bloody rebel;

and some of them in after ages to David el David, a wandering juggler; and Moses Cretensis, and sundry other pretenders, have they given up themselves to be deluded by (as of late unto the foolish apostate Sabadias, with his false prophets, R. Levi and Nathan), who never made the least appearance of any one character of the true Messiah, as Maimonides confesseth and bewaileth. The disputes of their late masters have not any thing more of certainty or consistency than those of their Talmudical progenitors. And this at length hath driven them to the present miserable relief of their infidelity and despair, asserting that he shall not come until immediately before the resurrection of the dead; only they take care that some small time may be left for them to enjoy wealth and pleasure, with dominion over the Edomites and Ishmaelites,—that is, Christians and Turks, under whom they live,—as they are yet full of thoughts of revenge and retaliation in the days of their Messiah. Now, whereunto can any man ascribe this fluctuation and uncertainty in and about that which was the great fundamental article of the faith of their forefathers, and their utter renunciation of the true notion and knowledge of the Messiah, but unto this, that having long ago renounced him, they exercise their thoughts and expectation about a chimera of their own brains, which, having no subsistence in itself, nor foundation in any work or word of God, can afford them no certainty or satisfaction in their contemplation about it?

3. Again; the *state* and condition of this people for the space of above sixteen hundred and thirty years gives evidence to the truth contended for. The whole time of the continuance of their church-state and worship, from the giving of the law on Mount Sinai to the final destruction of the city and temple by Titus, was not above sixteen hundred and thirty years, or sixteen hundred and forty upon the longest account, allowing all their former captivities and intermissions of government into the reckoning. They have, then, continued in a state of dispersion and rejection from God as long as ever they were accepted for his church and people. What their condition hath been in the world for these sixteen ages is known unto all, and what may be thence concluded we shall distinctly consider.

4. When God took the Jews to be his people, he did it by a special and solemn covenant. In this covenant he gave them promises, which were all made good unto them unto the utmost date and expiration of it in the coming of the Messiah. And they principally respected these three heads:—First, That they should possess the *land of Canaan*, and there enjoy that *worship* which he had prescribed unto them. See Exod. vi. 4, xxxiv. 10, 11; Lev. xxvi. 9–11; Deut. viii. 18, xxix. 13; Ps. cv. 10, 11. Secondly, That he would *defend them from their adversaries;* or if at any time he

gave them up to be punished and chastised for their sins, yet upon their repentance and supplications made unto him, he would deliver them from their oppressors, Deut. xxx. 1–5; Neh. i. 9; Deut. xxxii. 35, 36; 1 Kings viii. 33, 34. Thirdly, That he would *continue prophets among them*, to instruct them in his will, and to reclaim them from their miscarriages, Deut. xviii. 18. The whole Pentateuch, all their divine writings, are full of promises about these things; and, as we said, until the time limited for the expiration of that special covenant, they were all made good unto them. That it was to expire themselves are forced to acknowledge, because of the express promise of a new or another covenant to be made, not like unto it, Jer. xxxi. The land given them for inheritance, and the place designed for the worshp of God therein, were continued in their possession, notwithstanding the mighty attempts made by the nations of the world for their extirpation. And when at any time he gave them up for a season unto the power of their adversaries, because of their sins and provocations,—as unto the Babylonians in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, and afterwards unto the Grecians or Syrians in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes,—yet still he foretold them of their condition, promised them deliverance from it, and in a short time accomplished it, though it could not be done without the ruin of other kingdoms and empires. The oppression of the Babylonians continued but seventy years; and the persecution of Antiochus prevailed only for three years and a half. Prophets also he raised up unto them in their several generations, yea, in the time of their great distress; as Jeremiah at the time of their desolation, Ezekiel and Daniel in Babylon, Haggai and Zechariah in their poverty after their return: which dispensation ceased not until they pointed out unto them the end of the covenant, and told them that the Messiah should come speedily and suddenly unto his temple, Mal. iii. 1.

5. The present Jews, I hope, will not deny but that God is faithful still, and as able to accomplish his promises as he was in the days of old. Let us, then, inquire whether they enjoy any one thing promised them in the covenant, or any thing relating thereunto, or have done so since the days wherein, as we have proved, the Messiah was to come. First, For the *country* given unto them by covenant, and the place of God's worship therein, the whole world knows, and themselves continually complain, that strangers possess it, they being utterly extirpated and cast out of it. It is with them all as it was with Abraham before the grant of the inheritance was accomplished,—they have not possession of one foot in it in any propriety, no, not even for a burying-place. Their temple is destroyed, and all their attempts for the restoration of it, which God so blessed of old, frustrated, yea ceased. Their daily sacrifice is ceased; and

whatever they substitute in the room of it is an open abomination unto the Lord. We need not insist on these things. The stories of their ruin, exile, vain attempts to recover the land of their forefathers, and of the utter pollution of the place of their worship, are known to themselves and all men that take care to know aught of these things. Where is now the covenant of the land of Canaan? Was it to be absolutely everlasting? Whence comes it to pass that the great promise of it doth utterly fail? Was it to expire? What period can be assigned unto its duration but only that of the coming of the Messiah, and the establishment of a new covenant in him? Is not the denial hereof the ready way to make the men of the world turn atheists, and to look upon the scriptures of the Old Testament as a mere fable, when they shall be taught that the promises contained in it were but conjectures, deceitful words, that came to nothing?

6. Again; how are they *delivered from their adversaries?* how are they defended from their oppressors? There is not a known nation in the world wherein they live not, either openly or privately, in exile and banishment from their own land. About their oppressions and against their oppressors they have cried out and prayed after their manner, for many generations. Where is the protection, the deliverance promised? If the time be not yet expired for the coming of the Messiah, why are they not delivered? What word is there in the Law or the Prophets, that they shall not be delivered out of temporal distresses any other way but by the Messiah? Hath it not been otherwise with them? Were they not delivered from former oppressions and captivities by other means? Could not God of old have dispossessed the Romans of the land of Canaan, and afterwards the Saracens? and can he not now the Turks as easily as he did the Babylonians, Persians, and Grecians? If the covenant of those promises be not expired in the coming of the Messiah, what account can they give of these things?

7. Further; where are the *prophets* promised unto them? Can they name one since the days of John Baptist, whom they owned for a prophet? Hath any one amongst them pretended to any such thing, whom the event and themselves thereon have not discovered to be an impostor? Such was Theudas and Moses Cretensis, with some few others. Is it not strange that they, who never long wanted a prophet in their straits and difficulties, and sometimes had many of them together, should now, in their utmost misery, wanderings, and darkness, be left utterly destitute of any one for one thousand six hundred years, and upwards? It is the general confession of all their masters, that they have lost the Holy Ghost, or Spirit of prophecy. After the finishing of the second temple, they say, and they say truly, that prophecy ceased. בי משנבנה הבית השני לא קם נביא עוד

ביישראל זולתי מישתמישין בבת קול, saith Saadias Haggaon on Dan. ix.;—"Israel had no prophet after the finishing of the second house, but those who enjoyed the Bath Kol." But what is now become of that Bath Kol also, for a thousand and six hundred years? Is not all pretence of revelations utterly departed? What, then, is become of that covenant wherein it was promised unto them? Yea, we know that they have not only lost the Holy Ghost as a Spirit of prophecy, but also as a Spirit of grace and supplications; so that, besides a few *superstitious forms,* repeated by number and tale, there is no such thing as prayer amongst them, as some of their late masters have acknowledged.

8. What reason, now, can be assigned for this state and condition of things, but only that the covenant wherein the good things mentioned were promised unto them had a time limited unto it, when it was to give place unto a *new* one of another nature? And this the Jews acknowledge is to take date from the coming of the Messiah. God is faithful, unchangeable, able to make good his promises and his word to the utmost. The present Jews are no less Jews of the carnal seed of Abraham than their forefathers were. It cannot be, then, but that the covenant made with them until the coming of the Messiah is long since expired; and therefore, also, that he is long since come.

9. Two things in general the Jews reply unto these considerations,—the one as they have occasion and advantage, the other openly and constantly. The first, which they only mention as they have occasion, is the *prosperity* of some of their nation in this or that country, with the honour and riches that some of them have attained unto. Unto this purpose they tell us stories of their number and wealth in the east, out of Benjamin Tudelensis and others; with the riches of some of them in the western parts of the world also. But themselves know that none of these things, not one of them, was promised unto them in the covenant that God made with them upon Mount Horeb. All the promises of it respected the land of Canaan, with their preservation there, or return thither. What they get abroad in the world elsewhere, under the power and dominion of other nations, befalls them in a way of common providence, as the like things do the vilest wretches of the earth, and not in a way of any especial promise. And therefore when Daniel and Nehemiah, with others, were exalted unto glory and riches among the Babylonians and Persians, yet they rested not therein, but pleaded the covenant of God for their restoration unto the land promised unto Abraham. And to suppose that the wealth of a few Jews up and down the world, gotten by physic, or usury, or farming of customs, is an accomplishment of the promises before insisted on, is openly to despise the promises and the Author of them.

10. But it is pleaded, secondly, by them, that it is for their sins that the coming of the Messiah is thus retarded and prolonged. But it is not about the coming of the Messiah directly and immediately that they are pressed withal in these considerations. That which we inquire about is their present state, and their long continuance therein, with the reason of it, only aiming to find out and discover the true cause thereof. This, they say, is *because of their sins;* and this also in general we grant, but yet we must further inquire what they intend thereby. I ask, therefore, whether it be for the *sins of their forefathers,* who lived before the last final dispersion, or for *their sins who have since lived* in their several generations, that they are thus utterly forsaken. If they shall say it is for the sins of their forefathers,—as Manasseh plainly doth, Quest. 43, in Gen. p. 65, and sundry others of them do the same,—then I desire to know whether they think God to be changed from what he was of old, or whether he be not still every way the same as to all the promises of the covenant? Supposing they will say that he is still the same, I desire to know whether he did not in former times, in the days of their judges and kings, especially in the Babylonian captivity, punish them for their sins with that contemperation of justice and mercy which was agreeable unto the tenor of the covenant? This, I suppose, they will not deny, the Scripture speaking so fully unto it, and the righteousness of God requiring it. I desire, then, to know what were the sins of their forefathers before the destruction of the second temple and the final dispersion, which so much, according to the rules of the covenant, exceeded the sins of them who lived before the desolation of the first temple and the captivity that ensued. For we know that the sins of those former were punished only with a dispersion, which some of them saw the beginning and ending of, the duration of the whole of it not exceeding seventy years, after which they were returned again to their own land; but the captivity and dispersion which hath befallen them upon the sins of those who lived before the destruction of the second temple, as they were in their manner and entrance much more terrible, dreadful, and tremendous than the former, so they have now continued in them above *twenty times seventy years* without any promise of a recovery. God being still the same that he was, if the old covenant with the Jews be still in force, the difference between the dispensations must arise from the difference of the sins of the one sort of persons and the other. Now, of all the sins which, on the general account of the law of God, the sons of men can make themselves guilty of, idolatry doubtless is the greatest. The choosing of other gods is a complete renunciation of the true one, and therefore comprises in it all other sins whatever; for casting off the yoke of God, and our dependence on him as the first cause and last end

of all, it doth that in gross and by wholesale which other sins do only by retail. And therefore is this sin forbidden in the head of the law, as intimating that if the command of owning the true God, and him alone, be not adhered unto, it is to no purpose to apply ourselves unto them that follow. Now, it is known to all that this sin of idolatry abounded amongst them under the first temple, and that also for a long continuance, attended with violence, adulteries, persecution, and oppression, but that those under the second temple had contracted the guilt of this sin the present Jews do not pretend, and we know that they hated all appearance of it, nor are they able to assign any other sin whatever wherein they went higher in their provocations than their progenitors under the first temple. What, then, is the cause of the different event and success between them before insisted on? It cannot be but that either they have contracted the guilt of some sin wherewith God was more displeased than with the idolatry of their forefathers, or that the covenant made with them is expired, or that there hath been a coincidence of both these. And this indeed is the condition of things with them. The Messiah came, in whom the carnal covenant was to expire, and they rejected and slew him, justly deserving their perpetual rejection from it and disinheritance.

11. Sometimes they will plead that it is for their own sins and the sins of the generations that succeeded the destruction of the second temple that they are kept thus long in misery and captivity. But we know that they use this plea only as a covering for their obstinate blindness and infidelity. Take them from this dispute, and they are continually boasting of their righteousness and holiness: for they do not only assure us that they are better than all the world besides, but also much better than their forefathers, as Manasseh plainly affirms in the place before cited; and that on the *day of expiation*, that is once a-year, they are as holy as the angels in heaven! There are, therefore, one or two things which I would desire to know of them as to this pretence of their own sins, which on another account must also be afterwards insisted on.

First, then, Whereas it is a principle of their faith, that *all Jews*, excepting apostates, are so *holy* and righteous that they shall all be saved, have all a portion in the blessed world to come, whence is it that none of them are so righteous as to be returned unto the land of Canaan? Is it not strange, that that righteousness which serves the turn to bring them all to heaven will not serve to bring any one of them to Jerusalem, this latter being more openly and frequently promised unto them than the former? I know not how to solve this difficulty; *ipsi viderint.*

Again, *repentance* from their sins is a thing wholly in their own power, or it is not. If they shall say it is in their own power, as

generally they do, I desire to know why they defer it? The brave imaginations that they have, of the levelling of mountains, the dividing of rivers, the singing of woods and dancing of trees, of the coaches and chariots of kings to carry them, as also their riding upon the shoulders of their rich neighbours into Jerusalem, the conquest of the world, the eating of behemoth and drinking the wine of paradise, the riches, wives, and long life, that they shall have in the days of the Messiah, do make them, as they pretend, patiently endure all their long exile and calamity. And can this not prevail with them for a little repentance, which they may perform when they please with a wet finger, and so obtain them all in a trice? If they are so evidently blind, foolish, and mad, in and about that which they look upon as their only great concernment in this world, have they not great cause to be jealous lest they are also equally blind in other things, and particularly in that wherein we charge them with blindness? This, it seems, is the state of these things: Unless they repent, the Messiah will not come; unless he come, they cannot be delivered out of their calamity, nor enjoy the promises. To repent is a thing in their own power; which yet they had rather endure all miseries, and forego all the promises of God, than take in hand, or go through with it. And what shall we say to such a perverse generation of men, who openly proclaim that they will live in their sins, though they have never more to do with God unto eternity? If they shall say that repentance is the gift of God, and that without his pouring forth his Spirit upon them they cannot attain unto it, then I desire to know whence it is that God doth not give them repentance, as he did to their forefathers, if the covenant continue established with them as in former days?

From what hath been discoursed, it doth sufficiently appear that the state and condition of the Jews hath been such in the world for these sixteen hundred years as manifests the end of their special covenant to be long since come, and consequently the Messiah, in whom it was to expire.

12. There is one of them, a nameless person, not unlearned, who hath written somewhat lately in the Portuguese language, which is translated into Latin by Brenius the Socinian, who gives so satisfactory an answer, in his own conceit, unto this argument, that he concludes that every one who is not obstinate or blinded with corrupt affections must needs acquiesce therein! His confidence, if not his reasons, deserves our consideration, especially considering that he offers somewhat new unto us, which their former masters did not insist upon.

That, then, which he returns as an answer unto the inquiry of the *causes and reasons* of their present long captivities and misery, is the *sins of their forefathers* under the first temple. The greatness

of these sins, he saith, is expressed by the prophet Ezekiel, chap. xvi. 48, "As I live, saith the Lord GOD, Sodom thy sister hath not done, she nor her daughters, as thou hast done, thou and thy daughters." To which he adds Isa. i. 9, where mention is made again of Sodom. So that this captivity is, to them, in the room of such a destruction as Sodom was overthrown withal.

But it may be said that those sins, whatever they were, were expiated in the Babylonish captivity, and pardoned unto them upon their return, so that now they must suffer on the account of their sins committed under the second temple; to which he replies that this exception is of no force: "Nam liberatio e Babylone nihil aliud fuit quam exploratio, qua Deus experiri voluit, an, cum restitutione regni et templi, possint abbreviari et expiari enormia ista quæ commiserant, adulterii, homicidii, et idololatriæ peccata; sed pro antecedentium debitorum solutione, quam prestare debuerunt, nova insuper debita accumulaverunt;"—"For the deliverance from Babylon was nothing but a trial, whereby God would make an experiment, whether, with the restitution of their kingdom and temple, those enormous sins of adultery, murder, and idolatry, which they had committed, might have been cut off and expiated; but instead of a discharge of their former arrears, which they were obliged unto, they heaped up new debts by their sins." Thus he. At their deliverance out of Babylon, the people had no discharge of their former sins by the pardon of them, but were only tried how they would afresh acquit themselves, with a resolution in God, if they made not satisfaction then for those sins, to charge the guilt of them again upon themselves and all their posterity, for all the generations that are past until this day. But,—

First, This is plainly a fiction of this man's own devising. Let him produce any one word from the Scripture, where it treats of these things, in the least giving countenance thereunto, or let him show how this procedure is suitable unto the justice of God, either unto the general notion that we have of it, or as unto any other instance recorded of it in the Scripture. But if these men may feign what they please, there is no doubt but they will justify themselves and maintain their own cause.

Secondly, Why did none of the latter prophets whom God granted unto the people after their return from captivity, as Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, let the people know that this was the condition of their return unto their land, but only require of them to walk answerably unto the mercies they had then received?

Thirdly, As the very nature of the dispensation did declare that God, having purged out the rebels of the people, and destroyed them with his sore judgments, had forgiven their sins, and was returned unto them in a way of mercy and grace, never to call over their fore-

past iniquities any more, so the prophets that treated concerning that dispensation of God do in places innumerable assert the same, and plainly contradict this imagination.

Fourthly, God punisheth not the sins of the fathers upon their children unless the children continue in the sins of their fathers. This he declareth at large, Ezek. xviii. Now, what were the sins of this people under the first temple before their captivity? Our author reckons "adultery, murder, and idolatry." There is no doubt but many of them were adulterers, and that sin among ot' ers was charged on them by the prophets; but it is evident that thei principal ruining sins were their idolatry, and persecution or killing of the prophets. And God by Ezekiel declares that, in and by their captivity, he would punish and take away all their idolatry and adulteries even from the land of Egypt, or their beginning to be his people, chap. xxiii. 11, 27. Now, were the Jews, that is, the body of the people, guilty of these sins under the second house? It is known that from all idolatry they preserved themselves, which was that sin that in an especial manner was their ruin before; and as for killing the prophets, they acknowledge that after Malachi they had none, so that none could be persecuted by them but those whom they will not own to be prophets. But,—

Fifthly, Suppose that all those under the second house continued in the sins of their forefathers, which yet is false, and denied by themselves as occasion requires, yet what have the Jews done for sixteen hundred years, since the destruction of that house? They plead themselves to be holy, and, in application of the prophecy, Isa. liii., unto themselves, proclaim themselves innocent and righteous; at least they would not have us to think that the generality of them are adulterers, murderers, and idolaters. Whence is it, then, that the punishment of their fathers' sins lies so long on them? What rule of justice is observed herein? What instance of the like dispensation can they produce? For our part, we affirm that they continue unto this day in the same sin for which their forefathers under the second house were rejected and destroyed, and so know the righteousness of God in their present captivities and miseries. Besides,—

Sixthly, They say they abhor the sins of their forefathers, repent of them, and do obtain remission of sins through their observation of the law of Moses. Wherein, then, is the faithfulness of God in his promises unto them? Why are they not delivered out of captivity, why not restored to their land, according to express testimonies of the covenant made with them unto that purpose? There is no colour of truth or reason, therefore, in this evasion, which they invented to countenance themselves in their obstinate blindness and unbelief.

13. But our author yet adds an instance whereby he hopes to re-enforce and confirm his former answer. Saith he, "Deus per

manus Salamanassari decem tribus in captivitatem passus est abduci in regiones nobis incognitas, sexcentis fere annis ante destructionem templi secundi, hoc est, ante præsentem hanc nostram captivitatem, necdum in hodiernam hanc diem in terram suam reversæ aut dominio suo restitutæ sunt; quæ omnia, speciali Dei providentia, nobis ita evenerunt, ne quis causam hujus nostræ captivitatis speciali alicui peccato sub secunda domo commisso imputaret, cùm decem tribus qui tum abfuerunt captivitatem pati debent sexcentis annis longiorem;"—"God suffered the ten tribes to be carried captive by Shalmaneser into countries unknown to us, six hundred years before the destruction of the second temple and our present captivity, neither are they yet returned to their own land or restored to their former rule; all which things have happened unto us by the especial providence of God, that none might impute the cause of the captivity unto any sin committed under the second temple, seeing the ten tribes that were then absent must endure a captivity six hundred years longer." Neither will this instance yield them the least relief; for,—(1.) It was before granted that the sins under the *second* temple were even greater than those under the *first*, whence the punishment of them was revived, which is here denied, manifesting that this is an evasion invented to serve the present turn. (2.) Whatever is pretended, no impartial man, that owns the special relation of that people unto God, and his covenant with them, can but grant that their present rejection is for some outrageous sins breaking the covenant under the second temple, and continued in by themselves unto this day. (3.) The case of the *ten tribes*, after they had publicly rejected all that worship of God, and all that government of the people, which was appointed to type out and to continue unto the bringing forth of the Messiah, is different from that of the other tribes, to whom the promises were appropriated in Judah and in the house of David; so that their rejection implies no disannulling of the covenant. (4.) As all of the *two tribes* came not up to Jerusalem at the return from the captivity of Babylon, so very great numbers of the ten tribes appear so to have done; which being added to those multitudes of them which before that had fallen away to Judah, partly upon the account of the worship of God, partly upon the account of outward peace, when their own land was wasted, makes the condition of the body of the people to be one and the same; and these men committed, and their posterity continue in, the sins on which we charge their present dispersion and captivity. (5.) The *remnant of that people*, dispersed amongst strange nations, seems voluntarily to have embraced their manners and customs, and utterly to have forgotten their own land; whereas those with whom we have to do daily expect, desire, and endeavour a return thereunto. So that neither doth this evasion yield our present Jews

any relief, and we may return to the notions of their more ancient masters.

For a close, then, of these considerations, I shall add some of the concessions of the Jews themselves, which the evidence of the truth contended for hath at several seasons extorted from them. And this I shall not do as though they were of great importance in themselves or unto us, but only to discover their entanglements in contending against the light; for the present masters of their unbelief are more perplexed with the convictions of their predecessors than with the plainest testimonies of the Scripture, the authority of their predecessors being equal with them unto, if not more sacred than, that of the word of God itself.

First, then, being pressed with the testimony before insisted on out of Haggai, concerning the glory of the second temple, and the coming of the desire of all nations thereunto, they have a tradition that the Messiah was born the same day that the second temple was destroyed. The story, indeed, which they make it up with is weak, fabulous, and ridiculous, and he who is offended with the citation of such things out of their Talmudical doctors is desired only to exercise patience, until he shall be able himself to report from them things more serious and of greater importance; and yet from them must we learn the persuasions and convictions of the ancient Jews, or be utterly ignorant of them. Be their stories what they will, also, the powerful convincing evidence of truth, and the miserable shifts that the poor wretches are put unto to keep off the efficacy of it from their minds, do sufficiently appear in them.

14. The tradition mentioned they give us in Tractat. Bezaroth. Distinct. Hajakkor, in these words: אר" יודן בשם ר' איבו ביום שנולד משיח בו ביום חרב בית המקדש;—"Rabbi Joden, in the name of Rabbi Ibbo, said, 'The Messiah was born in the day that the house of the sanctuary was destroyed.'" And the story they tell to this purpose is as followeth:—"It came to pass that as a Jew was ploughing, his ox before him lowed, and there passed by him עורבי, 'an Arabian;' and he heard a voice saying, 'O Jew, the son of a Jew, loose thy oxen, for, behold, the house of the sanctuary is destroyed.' The ox lowed the second time; and he said, 'O Jew, the son of a Jew, yoke thy oxen, for, behold, Messiah the King is born.' He said unto him, 'What is his name?' He answered, מנחם, 'Menachem,'"—that is, "The Comforter." And in Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxx., they have a long story to the same purpose: אר" שמואל בר נחמן פעם אחת היה אליהו לטוב;—"Rabbi Samuel, the son of Nachman, said, As Elias of good memory was walking on the way, on that very day that the house of the sanctuary was destroyed, he heard בת קול, the Voice from heaven, crying unto him, 'The house of our holy sanctuary is brought unto destruction.' When Elias of

good memory heard this, he thought the whole world should be destroyed. He went, therefore, and finding בני אדם, men ploughing and sowing, he said unto them, 'The holy, blessed God is angry with the world,' (or 'all this generation,') כל העולם, 'and will destroy his house, and send his children into captivity among the nations of the world, and you are solicitous about this temporal life!' בת קול came forth again and said unto him, 'Let them alone, for unto Israel is born a Saviour.' He said unto the Voice, 'Where is he?' The Voice said unto him, 'In Bethlehem-Judah.' He went, and found a woman sitting in the door of her house, and her child lying in its own blood before her. He said unto her, 'My daughter, hast thou born a son?' She said unto him, 'Yea.' He said, 'And why doth it lie so long in its own blood?' She said unto him, 'Because of the great evil; for on this day wherein he is born the house of the sanctuary is destroyed.' He said unto her, 'My daughter, be of good courage, and take care of the child, for great salvation shall be wrought by his hand.' And she was straightway encouraged, and took care of him." In the process of this story, they tell us that this child was carried away by the four winds of heaven, and kept in the great sea four hundred years; of which afterwards. I doubt not but this tale is hammered out of the second of Luke, about the appearance of the angels to the shepherds, and their finding his mother in a stable. All the use that I intend to put this concession of theirs unto, is to urge the present Jews with a conviction and acknowledgment of their forefathers that the Messiah was to be born under the second temple.

15. Again; they have a tradition out of the school of one Elias, a famous master amongst them of the Tannarei or ante-Talmudical doctors, which they have recorded in the Talmud. Tractat. Sanhed. Distinct. Chelek, about the continuance of the world, which is as follows: תנא רבי׳ אליהו ששת אלפים שנה הוי העולם שני אלפים תהו שני אלפים תורה ושני אלפים ימות משיח;—"It is a tradition of Elias, that the world shall continue six thousand years; two thousand void," (which the gloss of Rabbi Solomon Jarchi reckons from the creation of the world unto the call of Abraham,) "two thousand to the law," (from thence to the destruction of the second temple,) "and two thousand to the days of the Messiah." It is incredible how the later rabbins are perplexed with this tradition of their masters, which is recorded in the Talmud as sacred. In the account they give in Shebet Jehuda of a disputation they had with one Jerome, a converted Jew, before the bishop of Rome, they know not how to disentangle themselves from the authority of it. The sum of their answer is, that the next words in the tradition are, that *that time is elapsed because of their sins;* but as others have already manifested that that gloss is no part of the tradition, but an addition of the

Talmudists, so we shall immediately manifest the vanity of that pretence. Others of them say that it sufficeth to maintain the truth and credit of the tradition, if the Messiah come at any time within the last two thousand years. But besides that even these also are now drawing towards their period, not a fifth part in their computation of that space of time remaining, this gloss is directly contrary to the very words of the tradition; for as two thousand years are assigned to the world before the law, and two thousand to the law, which they reckon from the call of Abraham to the ruin of the second temple, so the two thousand years allotted to the time of the Messiah must begin with his coming, as the other portions do one of them with the creation, the other with the call of Abraham, or else the space of time (above sixteen hundred years) between the expiration of the second two thousand years and the third must be left out of the computation, and the time limited for the duration of the world extended above sixteen hundred years beyond what is allotted unto it in their tradition.

16. Many other the like concessions and acknowledgments hath the evidence of truth wrested from sundry of them, which, having been collected by others, we shall not trouble the reader with their recital; those that have been insisted on may and do suffice to make good the argument in hand. And so we have fully demonstrated the second thing proposed unto confirmation,—namely, *that the true Messiah is long since come, and hath finished the work allotted unto him.* Now, whereas we have in our passage vindicated the testimonies insisted on from the particular exceptions of the Jews, it remaineth, for the closing of this discourse, that we consider the general answer which they give unto the whole argument taken from them all.

17. That which they principally insist on is a concession, with an exception, rendering, as they suppose, the whole useless to our purpose. They grant, therefore, that the time fixed on was determined for the coming of the Messiah, but add withal, it is prolonged beyond the limited season because of their sins; that is, that the promise of his coming at that season was not *absolute*, but *conditional*, —namely, on supposition that the Jews were righteous, holy, and worthy to receive him. Thus, unto the tradition of Elias before mentioned, determining the coming of the Messiah upon the end of the second two thousand years of the world's duration, they add in the Talmud. Tractat. Sanhed. Distinct. Chelek, cap. xi., these words as an exception: ובעונותינו שרבו יצאו מן שצאו;—"Because of our sins, those days have exceeded the time all that is past." And again they add in the same place: אמור רב כלו כל קצין נלן ואין הדבר תלוי אלא בתשובה ומעשים טובים;—"Rabbi said, All times appointed are finished, and this matter is not suspended but upon account of repentance and good works." And nothing is more common with them than

this condition, 'If they deserve it, if they repent, the Messiah will come; the time is already past, but because of our sins he is not come.' If all Israel could repent but one day, he would come. This is the sum of their answer: There was a time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah; this time is signified in general in the Scripture to be before the destruction of the second temple, and the utter departure of scribe and lawgiver from Judah: but all this designation of the time was but conditional, and the accomplishment of it had respect unto their righteousness, repentance, good works, and merits; which they failing in, their Messiah is not yet come. To this issue is their infidelity at length arrived. But there are reasons innumerable that make naked the vanity of this pretence. Some of them I shall briefly insist upon at present, and more fully afterwards.

18. First, We have before proved that not the Jews only, but the Gentiles also, even the whole world, was concerned in the coming of the Messiah. The first promise of him concerned mankind in general, without the least particular respect unto any one peculiar people, Gen. iii. 15. The next solemn renovation of it unto Abraham extends the blessing wherewith it was to be attended unto *all the kindreds of the earth*, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18. The whole restriction of the promise unto him and to his posterity consisted only in the designation of them to be the means of bringing forth that Messiah who was to be a blessing unto all nations; and when Jacob foretells his coming of Judah, Gen. xlix. 10, he declares who were to have an equal share in the blessing of it together with his posterity. "To him," saith he, "shall be the gathering of the people." The same course do all the succeeding prophets proceed in. They everywhere declare that the Gentiles, the nations of the world, were equally concerned with the Jews in the promise of the coming of the Messiah, if not principally intended, because of their greatness and number. In mercy, love, compassion, and philanthropy, did God provide this blessed remedy for the recovery of mankind (both Jews and Gentiles) out of that misery whereinto they had cast themselves by sin and apostasy from him. The time of exhibiting this remedy unto them he promised also, and limited, stirring them up unto an expectation of its accomplishment, as that whereon all their happiness did depend. Shall we now suppose that all this love, grace, and mercy of God towards mankind, his faithfulness in his promises, were all suspended on the goodness, righteousness, merits, and repentance, of the Jews? that God, who so often testifies concerning them that they were a people wicked, obstinate, stubborn, and rebellious, should make them keepers of the everlasting happiness of the whole world? that he hath given the fountain of his grace and love, which he intended and promised should overflow the whole earth, and make all

the barren wildernesses of it fruitful unto him, to be closed and stopped by them at their pleasure? that it should be in their power to restrain all the promised effects of them from the world? As if he should say in his promises, 'I am resolved, out of mine infinite goodness and compassion towards you, O ye poor, miserable sons of Adam, to send you a Saviour and a Deliverer, who at such a time shall come and declare unto you the way of life eternal, shall open the door of heaven, and save you from the wrath that you have deserved. But I will do it on this condition, that the Jews, an obstinate and rebellious people, be good, holy, righteous, and penitent; for unless they be so, the Saviour shall not come, nor is it possible he should until they be so. This of themselves they will never be, nor do I intend to make them so.' If they can persuade us that God hath thus placed them in his throne, and given his grace and truth into their hands, to make effectual or frustrate at their pleasure, and suspended his good-will towards the residue of mankind on their obedience, whom he testifieth to have been always stubborn and disobedient, they may also hope to prevail with us to believe that they only are men, and all others beasts, as some of their Talmudical masters have affirmed. At present we find, by blessed experience, that their wickedness hath not made the truth of God of no effect.

19. Secondly, When God limited and foretold the time of the coming of the Messiah, he either foresaw what would be the state and condition of the Jews, as to their repentance and good works, or he did not? If they say he did not, then, besides that they deny him to be God, by denying those *essential attributes* of his nature which the very heathen acknowledged in their deities, they also utterly overthrow all the prophecies and predictions of the Old Testament; for there is not any one of them but depends on a supposition of the prescience of God: and this is nothing but to countenance their unbelief with perfect atheism. If they say he did foresee that their conditions and manners would be such as the event hath proved them, whence he must also know that it was impossible that the Messiah should come at the time limited and determined, I ask to what end and purpose he doth so often, and at so great a distance of time, promise and foretell that he should come at such a time and season, seeing he knew perfectly that he should not so do, and so that not one word of his predictions should be fulfilled? Why, I say, did he fix on a time and season, foretell it often, limit it by signs infallible, give out an exact computation of the years from the time of his predictions, and call all men unto an expectation of his coming accordingly, when, by his foresight of the Jews' want of merit and repentance, no such thing could possibly fall out? God, who is ἀψευδής, doth not deal thus with the sons of men. This were not to promise and foretell in infinite veracity, but purposely

to deceive. The condition, then, pretended cannot be put upon the promise of the coming of the Messiah without a *direct denial of some*, and, by just consequence, of *all the essential properties* of the nature of God.

20. Thirdly, There is not in the whole Scripture the least intimation of any such condition as that which they pretend the promise insisted on to be clogged withal. It is nowhere said, nowhere intimated, that if the Jews repented and merited well, the Messiah should come at the time mentioned; nowhere threatened that if they did not so, his coming should be put off unto an uncertain day. We know not, nor are they able to inform us, whence they had this condition, unless they will acknowledge that they have forged it in their own brains, to give countenance unto their infidelity. Before the time allotted was elapsed, and they had obstinately refused him who was sent, and came according unto promise, there was not the least rumour of any such thing amongst them. Some of their predecessors invented it to palliate their impiety; which so they may do, they are not solicitous what reflection it may cast upon the honour of God. Besides, as the Scripture is silent as to any thing that may give the least colour unto this pretence, so it delivers that which is contrary unto it and destructive of it; for it informs us that the season of the coming of the Messiah shall be a time of great sin, darkness, and misery; which also their own masters, in other places and on other occasions, acknowledge. So Isa. lii. liii; Jer. xxxi. 32, 33; Dan. ix. 24; Zech. xiii. 1; Mal. iii. 3, 4. He was to come to turn men from ungodliness, and not because they were turned so before his coming. There can be no place, then, for this condition.

21. Fourthly, The suggestion of this condition overthrows the rise of the promise, and the whole nature of the thing promised. We have before manifested that the rise and spring of this promise was *mere love* and sovereign grace. There was not any thing in man, Jew nor Gentile, that should move the Lord to provide a remedy and relief for them who had destroyed themselves. Now, to suspend the promise of this love and grace on the righteousness and repentance of them unto whom it was made, is perfectly to destroy it, and to place the merit of it in man, whereas it arose purely from the grace of God. Again, it utterly takes away and destroys the nature of the thing promised. We have proved that it is a relief, a recovery, a salvation from sin and misery, that is the subject-matter of this promise. To suppose that this shall not be granted unless men, as a condition of it, deliver themselves from their sins, is to assert a plain contradiction, so wholly to destroy the promise. He was not promised unto men because they were penitent and just, but to make them so; and to make the righteousness of Jews or Gentiles the condition of his coming, is to take his work out of his

hand, and to render both him and his coming useless. But this figment proceeds from the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the Jews,—namely, that the Messiah is not promised to free them from their *own sins*, but to make them *possessors of other men's goods;* not to save their *souls*, but their *bodies and estates;* not to make men *heirs of heaven*, but *lords of the earth:* which folly hath been before discovered and disproved.

22. Fifthly, The Jews on several accounts are αὐτοκατάκριτοι, or *self-condemned*, in the use of this plea or pretence. Their great sins, they say, are the cause why the coming of the Messiah is retarded. But, (1.) What those sins are they cannot declare. We readily grant them to be wicked enough; but withal we know their great wickedness to consist in that which they will not acknowledge,—namely, not in being unfit for his coming, but in refusing him when he came. They instance sometimes in their hatred one of another, their mutual animosities, and frequent adulteries, and want of observing the Sabbath according to the rules of their present superstitious scrupulosity. But what is all this unto the abominations which God passed over formerly in their nation, and also fulfilled his promises unto them, though really conditional? (2.) Take them from the rack of our arguments, and you hear no more of their confessions, no more of their sins and wickedness, but they are immediately all righteous and holy, all beloved of God, and better than their forefathers. Yea, (3.) On the day of expiation, they are all as holy (if we may believe them) as the angels in heaven,—there is not one sin amongst them; so that it is strange the Messiah should not, at one time or another, come to them on that day. (4.) They have a tradition among themselves, that the coming of the Messiah may be hastened, but not retarded. So they speak in their gloss on Isa. lx. 22, "I the LORD will hasten it in his time:" Tractat. Sanhed., אלכסנדרי ריבל' דמי כתיב בעתה וכתיב אחישנה זכו אחישנה לא זכו בעתה;— "Rabbi Alexander said, and Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, 'It is written in his time, and it is written, I will hasten it, I will hasten it if they deserve it, and if they deserve it not, yet in its own time.'" And this they apply to the coming of the Messiah. (5.) They assert, many of them, that it is themselves who are spoken of in the 53d of Isaiah, and their being causelessly afflicted by the Gentiles. Now, he whom the prophet there speaks of is one perfectly innocent and righteous; and so they must needs be in their own esteem, supposing themselves there intended. So that this pretence is known to themselves to be no more [than a pretence.]

23. Sixthly, This plea is directly contrary to the nature of the covenant which God promised to make at the coming of the Messiah, or that which he came to ratify and establish, and to the reason which God gives for the making of that covenant, Jer. xxxi. 31–33. The foundation of the new covenant lies in this, that the people

had disannulled and broken the former made with them. Now, surely they do not disannul that covenant if they are righteous according to the tenor of it; and unless they are so, they say the Messiah will not come,—that is, the new covenant shall not be made unless by them it be first made needless! Again, the nature of the covenant lies in this, that God in it *makes men righteous and holy*, Ezek. xi. 19; so that righteousness and holiness cannot be the conditions of making it, unless it be of making it useless. This, then, is the contest between God and the Jews: He takes it upon himself to give men righteousness by the covenant of the Messiah; they take it upon themselves to be righteous, that he may make that covenant with them.

24. Lastly, If the coming of the Messiah depend on the righteousness and repentance of the Jews, it is not only possible but very probable that he may never come. Themselves conceive that the world shall not continue above six thousand years. Of this space they do not suppose that there is any more than five hundred remaining. The time past since the expiration of the days determined for the coming of the Messiah is at least sixteen hundred years. Seeing that they have not repented all this while, what assurance have we, nay, what hope may we entertain, within the four or five hundred years that are behind? Greater calls to repentance from God, greater motives from themselves and others, they are not like to meet withal. And what ground have we to expect that they who have withstood all those calls without any good fruit, by their own confession, will ever be any better? Upon this supposition, then, it would be very probable that the Messiah should never come. Nothing can be replied hereunto, but that God will either at length effectually by his grace give them that repentance which they make necessary for his coming, or that he will send him at last whether they repent or no; but if either of these may be expected, what reason can be imagined why God should so deal at any season concerning which he had made no promise that the Messiah should come therein, and not do so at the time concerning which he had so often promised and foretold that he should come therein?

EXERCITATION XVII.

THE THIRD GENERAL DISSERTATION, PROVING JESUS OF NAZARETH TO BE THE ONLY TRUE AND PROMISED MESSIAH.

1. Jesus whom Paul preached, the true Messiah. 2, 3. First argument, from the time of his coming—Foundation of this argument unquestionable. 4. Coming of Jesus at the time appointed, proved by Scripture record and catholic tradition; 5. By the testimonies of heathen writers; 6. By the confession of the Talmudical Jews—Jesus Christ intended by them in their story of

Jesus the son of Pandira and Stada. 7. No other came at that season by them owned. 8. Force of this argument. 9. Characteristical notes of the Messiah given out in the Old Testament. 10. His family, stock, or lineage, confined unto the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David. 11. Our Lord Jesus of the posterity of Abraham and tribe of Judah; also of the family of David—Testimonies of the evangelists vindicated. 12. Jewish exceptions in general answered; 13. In particular, the genealogy not proved, answered. 14. The genealogy of Matthew declared; 15. And of Luke. 16. Jewish genealogies not trustworthy. 17. The place of the birth of the Messiah, Bethlehem, Mic. v. 1. 18. Circumstances enforcing this consideration. 19. The evangelist's citation of the words of the prophet vindicated. 20. The Messiah to be born of a virgin, Isa. vii. 10-16, and Matt. i. 22, 23. 21. Jews convinced that Jesus was born of a virgin. 22. Jewish exceptions to the application of this prophecy—Their weight. 23. The answer of some unto them unsafe, needless. 24, 25. True sense of the words—Exceptions answered. 26, 27. The signification and use of עַלְמָה. 28. Greatness of the sign promised. 29, 30. No other virgin and son designed but Jesus Christ and his mother—The prophecy cleared in this instance. 31. In what sense the birth of the Messiah was a sign of present deliverance. 32, 33. Remaining objections answered. 34. Other characters of the Messiah. 35. He was to be a prophet, Deut. xviii. 18, 19—A prophet like unto Moses expected by the Jews. 36. Jesus Christ a prophet; that prophet. 37. The nature of the doctrine which he taught—Its perfection. 38. The works of the Messiah revealed only in the gospel of Christ. 39. Also the nature and end of Mosaical institutions. 40. Threatenings unto the disobedient fallen upon the Jews. 41. Sufferings are another character of the Messiah. 42. His passion foretold, Ps. xxii.—The true Messiah therein intended—Expositions of Kimchi and others confuted. 43. Sufferings peculiar unto the Messiah. 44. The psalm exactly fulfilled in Jesus Christ. 45. Objections of the Jews from the principles of Christians answered. 46. Isa. liii. a prophecy of the suffering of the Messiah. 47. Consent of ancient Jews—Targum, Bereshith Rabba, Talmud, Alshech. 48-53. Invalidity of exceptions of later rabbins—Application to the Lord Jesus vindicated. 54 Other testimonies concerning the sufferings of the Messiah. 55. Jewish traditions to the same purpose. 56. Other arguments proving Jesus to be the true Messiah. 57, 58. Miracles; the nature of them; 59. Wrought by Christ, proved. 60. Testimony of the gospel. 61. Notoriety of the miracles, and of tradition. 62. Miracles of Christ compared with those of Moses. 63. Excelling them in number; 64. In manner of their being wrought; 65. In their nature; 66. In his giving power to others to effect them; 67. In his resurrection from the dead; 68. Continuance of them in the world. 69. Sum of this argument. 70, 71. Conviction of the Jews evinced. 72, 73. Causes of the miracles of Christ assigned by them—Magical art retorted; removed. 74. The name of God. 75. Testimony of his disciples. 76. Success of the doctrine of Jesus—Last argument.

1. The *third* branch of that great supposition and fundamental article of faith whereon the apostle builds his arguments and reasonings wherewith he deals with the Hebrews, is, *that Jesus whom he preached was the true and only promised Messiah*, who came forth from God for the accomplishment of his work, according to the time determined and foretold. The confirmation of this foundation of our faith and profession is that which now, in the third

place, we must engage in. A subject this is whereon I could insist at large with much satisfaction to myself, nor have I just cause to fear that the matter treated of would be irksome to any Christian reader; but we must have respect unto our present design, for it is not absolutely and of set purpose that we handle these things, but merely with respect unto that further end of opening the springs of the apostle's divine reasonings in this epistle, and therefore we must contract, as much as may be, the arguments that we have to plead in this case; and yet neither can this be so done but that some continuance of discourse will be unavoidably necessary. And the course we shall proceed in is the same we have passed through in our foregoing demonstrations of the promise of the Messiah and of his coming. Our arguments are first to be produced and vindicated from the particular exceptions of the Jews, and then their opposition to our thesis in general is to be removed, referring an answer unto their special objections unto another dissertation.

2. That we may the more orderly annex our present discourse unto that foregoing, our first argument shall be taken from that which is proved and confirmed therein,—namely, the time limited and determined for the coming of the Messiah. Two ways there are whereby the time fore-appointed of God for the coming of the Messiah is signified and made known:—First, By certain τεκμήρια, or evident tokens, taken from the Judaical church, with the state and condition of the whole people of the Jews. This we have insisted on from Gen. xlix. 10; Hag. ii. 3, 6–9; Mal. iii. 1. Secondly, By a computation of the time itself as to its duration, from a certain *fixed date* unto its expiration. This way we have unfolded and vindicated at large from Dan. ix. 24–27. And although herein we have evidenced the truth and exactness of the computation insisted on by us, as far as any chronological accounts of time past are capable of being demonstrated, yet we have also manifested that our argument depends not on the precise bounding of the time limited, but lying ἐν πλάτει, is of equal force however the computation be calculated, the whole time limited being undeniably expired before or at the destruction of the city and temple. Hence is the foundation of our first argument:—

Before or at the expiration of that time the promised Messiah was to come; before or that time, as denoted and described by the general τεκμήρια, or evident tokens before mentioned, and limited by the computation insisted on, came Jesus, and no other that the Jews can or do pretend to have been the Messiah: and therefore he was the true, promised Messiah.

3. The foundation of this argument,—namely, that the Messiah was to come within the time limited, prefixed, and foretold,—cannot be shaken without calling into question the truth of all promises and

predictions in the Old Testament, and consequently the faithfulness and power of God. The great design, whose lines are drawn in the face, and whose substance lies in the bowels of the Old Testament, and which is the spirit that enlivens the whole doctrine and story of it, the bond of union wherein all the parts of it do centre, without which they would be loose, scattered, and deformed heaps, is the bringing forth of the Messiah, the Saviour of the world. Without an apprehension of this design, and faith therein, neither can a letter of it be understood, nor can a rational man discover any important excellency in it. *Him* it promiseth, *him* it typifieth, *him* it teacheth and prophesieth about, *him* it calls all men to desire and expect. When it hath done thus in several places, it expressly limits, foretells, and declares the time wherein he shall be sent and exhibited. If there be a failure herein, seeing it is done to give evidence to all other things that are spoken concerning him, by which they are to be tried, and to stand or fall as they receive approbation or discountenance from thence, to what end should any man trouble himself about that which is cast as a fancy and empty imagination by its own verdict? If, then, the Messiah came not within the time limited, all expectation from the scripture of the Old Testament must come to nought; which those with whom at present we contend will not grant.

Nor can the Jews, on such a supposition, in any measure defend the truth of it against an infidel; for unto his inquiry, Where is the promised Messiah? if they shall plead their usual pretences, it is easy for him to reply, that these things being nowhere mentioned or intimated in the *books themselves*, are only such subterfuges as any man may palliate the most open untruths withal. And, indeed, the ridiculous figment of his being born at the time appointed, but *kept hid to this day* they know not where, is not to be pleaded when they deal with men not bereft of their senses or judicially blinded by God; for besides that the whole of it is a childish, toyish fiction, inconsistent with the nature and being of their Messiah, whom they make to be a mere man, subject to mortality in his whole person, like all the other sons of Adam, it suits not at all unto the difficulty intended to be assoiled by it; for it is not his *being born* only, but also his *accomplishment of his work and office* at the time determined, which is foretold. Nor is there any one jot more of probability in their other pretence, about their *own sins* and unworthiness; for, as we have declared, this is nothing but in plain terms to assert that God hath violated his faith and promise, and that in a matter wherein the great concernments of his own glory and the welfare of all mankind do consist, upon the account of their miscarriages, which as they either can not or will not remedy, so he himself hath not (though he might have so

done) provided any relief against. This, then, stands upon equal evidence with the whole authority of the Old Testament,—namely, that the promised Messiah was to come within the time prefixed for his coming, and foretold.

We ask them, then, If Jesus of Nazareth be not the Messiah, where is he? or who is he that came in answer to the prophecies insisted on? Two things then remain to be proved:—First, That our Lord Jesus Christ came, lived, and died, within the time limited for the coming of the Messiah. Secondly, That no other came within that season that either pretended with any colour of probability unto that dignity, or was ever as such owned or esteemed by the Jews themselves.

4. First, then, that Jesus came and lived in the time limited unto the coming of the Messiah, some short space of time before the departure of *sceptre and scribe* from Judah, the ceasing of the daily sacrifice, and final desolation of the second temple, we have all the evidence that a matter of fact so long past is capable of,—as good as that the world was of old by God created. The stories of the church are express that he was born during the empire of Augustus Cæsar, in the latter end of the reign of Herod over Judea, when Cyrenius was governor over Syria; that he lived unto the time wherein Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea under Tiberius, about thirty-six or thirty-seven years before the destruction of the nation, city, and temple, by Titus. This the stories written by *divine inspiration*, and committed unto the care of the church, expressly affirm, neither have the Jews any thing to object against the truth of the relation, whatever thoughts they have of his person, who he was, or what he did. That he lived and died then and there, is left testified on records beyond control [*i.e.*, contradiction.] And if they should deny it, what is the *bare negation* of a few interested, blinded persons, without testimony or evidence from any one circumstance of times, persons, or actions, to be laid in the balance against the catholic tradition of all the world, whether believing in Jesus or rejecting him? for they all always consented in this, that he lived and died at the time mentioned in the sacred stories.

And this was still one part of the charge managed against his followers in the very next age after, that they believed in a person whom they knew to have lived at such a season, and in a mean condition; neither did the most malicious and fierce impugners of the religion taught by him, such as Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, ever once attempt to attack the truth of the story as to his real existence and the time of it. So that herein we have as concurrent a suffrage as the whole world in any case is able to afford.

5. The best of the historians of the nations who lived near those times give their testimony unto what is recorded in our Gospels. The

words of one of them, a person of unquestionable credit in things that he could attain the knowledge of, and, as it will appear by them, far enough from any compliance with the followers of Jesus, may suffice for an instance. This is Cornelius Tacitus, in the 15th of his Annals, cap. xliv. "Abolendo," saith he, "rumori" (he speaks of Nero and his firing of Rome) "subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat." He expressly assigns the time of the death of Christ unto the reign of Tiberius and government of Pilate. The same also is confirmed by the Jews' own historian, Flavius Josephus, in the fifth chapter of the 18th book of their Antiquities; unto which season also he assigns the death of John the Baptist, who was his contemporary, according to the evangelical story.

6. Further; we have that testimony in this matter which, though in itself it be of little or no moment, yet, as unto them with whom we have to do, is cogent above all others, and this is their own confession. They acknowledge in the Talmud that he lived before the desolation of the second temple, for they tell us, cap. Chelek, and ry, cap. ii., that he was the son of Pandira and Stada, and that he lived in the days of the Maccabees, Alexander, Hyrcanus, and Aristobulus, under whom he was crucified. I confess, Galatinus, Reuchlinus, and of late the learned Schickard, with some others, do contend that it is not Jesus Christ whom they intend in the wicked story which they tell of that Jesus the son of Pandira. But the reasons they insist on are of no cogency to procure the assent of any one acquainted with their writings, no, though the later Jews themselves (ashamed of the prodigious lies of their forefathers, and afraid to own their blasphemies, for fear of provoking the Christians against them) do faintly, some of them, deny him to be the person intended. The names of their parents, say they, agree not. The Lord Jesus was the reputed son of Joseph, the true son of Mary; this Jesus of the Talmud was the son of Pandira and Stada. I shall not reply that Damascenus, lib. iv., placeth a Panther and Barpanther on the genealogy of Christ, making the latter grandfather to the blessed Virgin, seeing it is evident that he borrowed that part of his genealogy from some corrupt traditions of the Jews.

The reasons why the Talmudists concealed the true names of the parents of Jesus are evident; for by this means they more covered their *malice* in one respect, and gave more blasphemous vent unto it in another. They concealed it thus far, that every one might not perfectly understand whom they intended, unless he were a disciple of their own; and they gave it vent in the reflection they cast upon the evangelical story, as though it had not given us the true names

of the parents of Jesus. And, moreover, they gave themselves liberty by this means to coin new lies at their pleasure, for they may say what they would of their Pandira and Stada, though all the world knew it to be false as to Joseph and Mary. פנדירא, "Pandira," is a feigned name, insignificant, and invented by them for this only purpose. They sometimes write it with ת in the midst, instead of ד; פנתירא, "Panthira." So that Galatinus doth perfectly contradict himself in this matter; for whereas, lib. i. cap. vii., he contends that by Jesus the son of Pandira, mentioned in the Talmud, the Lord Jesus is not intended, lib. viii. cap. v., he asserts that Jesus the son of Panthira, in whose name James the Just healed the sick and wrought miracles, was the Lord Jesus; as indeed it was he whom they intend also in that story about James. But now Pandira and Panthira are the same; and so also was he whom they term his son. סטדא, "Stada," is also a name framed to the same end, and, as the learned Buxtorf supposeth, from סטא דא, "one that went aside," declined, or was an adulteress; and they feign her to have been a plaiter of women's hair, with other monstrous lies at their pleasure: but yet they expressly, in sundry places, confess that her true name was Mary; and as I suppose, from the imputations mentioned, do wilfully confound her with Mary Magdalene, as Mohammed did with Miriam the sister of Moses. These stories must be searched for in the Talmud printed at Venice, for they are left out in that printed at Basil. The exception is yet more impertinent, that the things which are ascribed unto Jesus the son of Pandira can by no means be accommodated unto Jesus Christ; as though the Talmudical rabbins had ever accustomed themselves to speak one true word concerning him, or as though they intended not him in all those blasphemous lies wherewith they and their forefathers reproached him: which is all one as if we should say that it was another and not the Lord Jesus whom they accused of sedition, blasphemies, and seducing the people, because indeed he was most remote from such things. But yet, also, there were sundry things which they ascribed unto this Jesus the son of Pandira and Stada, which make it very apparent who it was whom they intended; for, first, they say that he learned magic in Egypt, which, upon his being carried thither in his infancy, they ascribe unto him. Again, they say he was a seducer of the people; which we know was the accusation that they managed against the Lord Jesus.

Again; they tell us a story concerning *two men* placed in a room near him to overhear his seducing, that so they might accuse him. This, they say, was their course to entrap seducers; and thereof they give this instance: וכן עשו לבן סטדא ותלאוהו בערב הפסח;—"So they did to the son of Stada; and they hanged him on the eve of the passover." The witnesses they speak of are no others but the *false*

witnesses mentioned Matt. xxvi. 60, 61. The kind of his death, *hanged* on a tree, with the time of it, the *eve of the passover*, do also fully make naked their intentions. The age only, or the time of his life, remains, from whence any difficulty is pretended. This Jesus the son of Pandira they affirm to have lived in the days of Alexander, and to have been crucified in the days of Aristobulus, an hundred or an hundred and ten years before the birth of Christ. But the mystery of this fiction also is discovered by Abraham Levita in his Cabbala Historiæ. He tells us that the "Christians placed the death of their Christ under Pilate, that so they might show that the destruction of the city and temple fell out not long after his death; whereas," he says, "it is apparent from the Mishnah and Talmud that he was crucified in the days of the Maccabees, an hundred years before." And here we have unawares the sore discovered, and the true reason laid open why the Talmudists attempted to transfer the time of his death from the days of Herod the tetrarch to the rule of Aristobulus the Asmonæan,—namely, lest they should be compelled to acknowledge their utter ruin to have so suddenly ensued upon their rejection of him, as indeed it did. However, as to our present purpose, we have in general this confession of our adversaries themselves, that the Lord Jesus came before the destruction of the city and temple; which was that we undertook to confirm.

7. We, secondly, in the pursuit of our argument, affirmed that no other person came at or within the time limited that could pretend to be the Messiah. This the Jews themselves confess, nor can they think otherwise without destroying themselves; for if any such person came, seeing they received him not, nor do own him unto this day, their guilt would be the same that we charge upon them for the refusing of our Lord Jesus. There is no need, then, that we should go over the tragical stories of Bar-Cochba, Moses Cretensis, David el David, and such other impostors; for whereas none of them came or lived within the time determined, so they are all disclaimed by themselves as seducers and causers of great misery unto their people and nation. Herein, then, we have the consent of all parties concerned; which renders all further evidence unnecessary.

8. From what, therefore, hath been spoken and disputed, it remaineth that either our Lord Jesus was and is the true Messiah, as coming from God in the season limited for that purpose, or that the whole promise concerning the Messiah is a mere figment, the whole Old Testament a fable; and so both the old and present religion of the Jews a delusion. At that season the Messiah must have come, or there is an end of all religion. If any came then, whom they had rather embrace for their Messiah than our Lord Jesus, let them do so, and own him, that we may know who he was, and what he hath done for them. If none such there were that can be so esteemed,

as in truth, and as themselves universally acknowledge, there was not, their obstinacy and blindness in refusing the only promised Messiah is such as no reasonable man can give an account of who doth not call to mind the righteous judgment of God in giving them up to blindness and obstinacy, as a just punishment for their rejecting and murdering his only Son. And this argument is of such importance, as that, with the consideration of the doctrine of Christ and his success in the world, it may well be allowed to stand alone in this contest.

9. Our second argument is taken from those *characteristical notes* that are given in the Scripture of the Messiah. Now, these are such as by which the church might know him, and upon which they were bound to receive him. All these we shall find to agree and centre in the person of our Lord Jesus. Some of the principal of them we shall therefore insist upon and vindicate from the exceptions of the Jews. The *stock whereof he came*, the *place and manner of his birth*, the *course of his life and death*, *what he taught*, and *what he suffered*, are the principal of those signs and notes that God gave out to discover the Messiah in his appointed time; and as they were very sufficient for that purpose, so upon the matter they comprise all the signs and tokens whereby any person may be predesigned and signified.

10. First, For the *family*, *stock*, or *lineage*, whereof he was to come, there was a threefold restriction of it, after the promise had for a long time run in general, that he should be of the seed of the woman, or take his nature from among mankind. The first was unto the *seed of Abraham*, Gen. xii. 3; and under that alone there was no more required but that he should spring from among his posterity, until God added that peculiar limitation unto it, "In *Isaac* shall thy seed be called," chap. xxi. 12. After this, in the family of Isaac, Jacob peculiarly inherited the promise; and his posterity being branched into twelve tribes or families, the rise or nativity of the Messiah was confined unto *the tribe of Judah*, Gen. xlix. 10. This made it further necessary that from him, by some one of the numerous families that sprang of him, he should proceed. Out of that tribe God afterwards raised the kingly family of David, to be a type and representation of the kingdom of the Messiah; and hereupon he restrained the promise unto that family, though not unto any particular branch of it. Hereunto no other restriction was ever afterwards added.

It was not, then, at any time made necessary by promise that the Messiah should proceed from the royal branch or family of the house of David, but only that he should be born of some of his posterity, by what family soever, rich or poor, in power or subjection, he derived his genealogy from him. His kingdom was to be quite of

another nature than that of David or Solomon; nor did he derive his title in the least thereunto from the right of the Davidical house to the kingdom of Judah. Thus far, then, it pleased God to design the stock and family of the Messiah: He was to be of the posterity of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David. And although this evidence in its latitude will conclude only thus far, that no one can be pretended to be the Messiah whose genealogy is not so derived by David and Judah unto Abraham, yet by the addition of this circumstance, in the providence of God, that no one since the destruction of the city and temple can plead or demonstrate that original, seeing this was given out for a note and sign to know him by, it proves undeniably that he whom we assert was the true Messiah; for to what end should this token of him be given forth to know him by, when all the genealogies of the people being utterly lost, it is impossible it should be of any use in the discovery of him?

11. First, then, as for Abraham, there is no question between us and the Jews but that the Lord Jesus was of his offspring and posterity; neither do they pretend any exception to his being of the tribe of Judah. The apostle in this Epistle asserts it as a thing notorious and unquestionable. Chap. vii. 14, Πρόδηλον γὰρ, saith he, ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν·—"It is every way" (or "altogether") "manifest that our Lord sprang of Judah." Πρόδηλον is in Greek authors not only "manifest," but openly and conspicuously so. Thus he is said θανεῖν προδήλως, in Sophocles, [Aj. 1311,] who died openly and gloriously by all men's consent. Thus was the birth of our Saviour among the Jews themselves, as to his springing from the tribe of Judah. The apostle declares that it was ἀναντιῤῥήτως, without any contradiction received amongst them and acknowledged by them; nor unto this day do they lay any exception unto this assertion. It remains that we prove him to have been of the family of David by some one signal branch of it; for, as we said, there is nothing in the promise restraining his original to the first, reigning family or the direct posterity thereof. Now this is purposely declared by two of the evangelists; who being Jews, and living amongst them, wrote the story of his life in the age wherein he lived, for the use of the Jews themselves, with the residue of mankind. Matthew, who calls his record of it Βίβλον γενέσεως, or סֵפֶר תּוֹלְדֹת, "The roll of his genealogies," shows in the front of it that he wrote it on purpose to declare that he was, according to the promise, of the posterity of Abraham and of the family of David: "Of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham;" that is, who was promised to Abraham and David to spring from their loins. Luke also, who derives his genealogy from the first giving of the promise unto Adam, brings it down through the several restrictions mentioned, by Abraham, Judah, and David. Other testimony or evidence in this matter of fact it is utterly impos-

sible for us to give, and unreasonable for any other to demand. It was written and published unto all the world by persons of unquestionable integrity, who had as much advantage to know the truth of the matter about which they wrote as any men ever had, or can have, in a matter of that nature. And this they did, not upon rumours or traditions of former days, but in that very age wherein he lived, and that unto the faces of them whose great interest it was to except against what they wrote, and who would undoubtedly have so done had they not been overpowered with the conviction of the truth of it. Had they had the least suspicion on the contrary, why did they not, in some of their consultations, and in their rage against him and his doctrine, once object this unto himself or his followers, that he was not of the family of David, and so could not be the person he pretended himself to be? Besides, the persons who wrote his genealogy sealed their testimony not only with their lives, but with their eternal condition. A higher assurance of truth can no man give.

12. Two things the present Jews except unto this testimony;—first, in general, they deny the authority of our witnesses, and deny the whole matter that they assert; secondly, in particular, they say they prove not the matter in question,—namely, that Jesus of Nazareth was of the family of David. For the first, they neither have nor do yield any other reasons but their own will and unbelief. They neither do nor will believe what they [the evangelists] have written. Record, testimony, tradition, or any circumstance contradicting their witness they have none; only they will not believe them. Now, whether it be meet that their mere obstinacy and unbelief, wherein and for which they perish temporally and eternally, should be of any weight with reasonable men, is easy to determine. Besides, I desire to know of the Jews whether they think it reasonable that any man, without reason, testimony, evidence, or record, to give him countenance, should call into question, disbelieve, and deny the things witnessed unto and written by Moses? It is known what they will answer unto this demand; and thereby they will stop their own mouths as to the refusal of our record in this matter. So that this exception, which amounts to no more but this, that the Jews believe not the gospel, and that because they will not, needs no particular consideration, it being that which we plead with them about in all these our discourses. And as unto our own faith, it is secured by all those evidences which we give of the sacred authority of the writings of the New Testament.

13. But, moreover, they except in particular that neither of the evangelists doth either assert or prove indeed that our Lord Jesus did spring from the family of David; for whereas they assert, and Christians believe, that he was born of the Virgin Mary without conjunction of man, and that Joseph was only reputed to be his

father, because his mother was legally espoused unto him, both genealogies belong unto Joseph alone, as is evident from the beginning of the one and the end of the other. Now, the Lord Jesus being not related unto Joseph but by the legal contract of his mother, he cannot be esteemed in his right to belong unto the family of David. This is pleaded by many of them, as also they take notice of the difficulties which have exercised many Christians in the reconciliation of the several genealogies recorded by the two evangelists; unto all which exceptions we shall briefly reply, and take them out of our way:—

14. First, Suppose it granted that the genealogy recorded by Matthew be properly the genealogy of Joseph, what madness is it to imagine, that, avowedly proposing to manifest Jesus Christ to have been of the family of David, and premising that design in the title of his genealogy, he doth not prove and confirm what he hath so designed according to the laws of genealogies, and of the legal, just asserting any one to be of such a tribe or family! No more is required, for the accomplishment of the promise, but that the Lord Jesus should be so of the family of David as it was required by the laws of families and genealogies that any person might belong unto it. Now, this might be by the *legal marriage* of his mother unto him who was of that family: for after that contract of marriage, whatever tribe or family she was of before, she was legally accounted to be of that family whereinto by her espousals she was ingrafted; and of that family, and no other, was he to be reckoned who was born of her after those espousals. Now, that the reckoning of families and relations among the Jews, by God's own appointment, did not always follow *natural generation*, but sometimes *legal institutions*, is manifest by the law of a man dying without issue; for when the next kinsman took the wife of the deceased, to raise up seed unto him, he that was born of the woman was by law not reckoned to be his son by whom he was begotten, but was to be the son and of the family of him that was deceased, to bear his name and inherit his estate, Deut. xxv. 5, 6. And this legal cognation Luke seems to intimate, chap. i. 27, where he says that the mother of Jesus was "espoused unto a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David," there being no reason to mention his family, but that the genealogy of his wife's son was to relate thereunto. And if this were the law of genealogies and legal relations unto tribes and families, as evidently it was, Matthew recording the genealogy of Joseph, to whom the blessed Virgin was espoused before the birth of Jesus Christ, doth record his, according to the mind of him who gave both law and promise; and upon this known rule of genealogies and legal relations may Matthew proceed in his recital of the pedigree of Joseph, and profess thereby to manifest how Jesus Christ

was the son of David, the son of Abraham. Secondly, Although there was no indispensable necessity among the Jews binding them to marry within their tribes, unless the women were inheritrixes, in which case provision was made that inheritances might not be transferred from one tribe unto another, Num. xxxvi. 6, 7, yet it is more than probable that the blessed Virgin Mary was of the same family with Joseph, and this so notoriously known, that, seeing genealogies were not reckoned by women, nor the genealogies of women directly recorded, there was no better or more certain way of declaring his pedigree who was born of Mary than by his unto whom she was so nearly related. So that, on several accounts, the genealogy recorded by Matthew proves Jesus Christ to have been of the family of David.

15. Secondly, As for Luke, he doth directly and of set purpose give us the genealogy of the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus; for the line of his progenitors, which he derives from Nathan, is not at all the same with that of Joseph, from Solomon, insisted on by Matthew. It is true, there are a Zorobabel and Salathiel in both genealogies, but this proves not both the lines to be the same; for the lines of Solomon and Nathan might by marriage meet in these persons, and so leave it indifferent which line was followed up from David; and the lines of Joseph and Mary might be separated again in the posterity of Zorobabel, Matthew following one of them, and Luke the other. This, I say, is *possible;* but the truth is (as is evident from the course of generations insisted on), that the Zorobabel and Salathiel mentioned in Matthew were not the same persons with those of the same names in Luke, those being of the house of Solomon, these of the house of Nathan: so that from David it is not the line of Joseph, but of the blessed Virgin, that is recited by Luke. And the words wherewith Luke prefaceth his genealogy do no way impeach this assertion, Ων ὡς ἐνομίζετο υἱὸς Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ηλί; for whereas these words, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, "as was supposed," are usually placed and read in parenthesis, the parenthesis may be better extended unto τοῦ Ηλί, including Joseph, "Being (as was supposed, the son of Joseph) the son of Heli." Or Joseph may be said to be the son of Heli, because his daughter was espoused unto him; otherwise the true natural father of Joseph was Jacob, as Matthew declares, Heli being the father of the blessed Virgin. So that both legally and naturally our Lord Jesus Christ was a descendant of the house and lineage of David, according unto the promise. And as this was unquestionable among the Jews in the days of his conversation in the flesh, so the present Jews have nothing of moment to oppose unto these unquestionable records.

16. This is the first characteristical note given of the Messiah whereby he might be known, and it hath strength added unto it by the providence of God, in that all genealogies among the Jews are

now so confounded, and have been so for so many generations, that it is utterly impossible that any one should rise amongst them and manifest himself to be of this or that particular family. The burning of their genealogies by Herod, the extirpation of the family of David by Vespasian, and their one thousand and six hundred years' dispersion, have put an utter end unto all probability about the genealogies amongst them. The Jews, indeed, pretend that the family of the Messiah shall be revealed by the miracles that he shall do; that is, by knowing him to be the Messiah, they shall know of what family he is. But this note of his family is given out to know him by; nor are we anywhere directed to learn his family from our knowledge of him.

17. Another note or sign pointing out the Messiah in prophecy, was the *place where he should be born;* which, added unto the *time* wherein and the *family* whereof he should be brought forth, evidently designed his person. The place of his nativity is foretold, Mich. v. 1, וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמֵּךְ לִי יֵצֵא לִהְיוֹת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמוֹצָאֹתָיו מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם;—"And thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, is it" (or, "it is") "little for thee to be amongst the thousands of Judah? Out of thee shall come forth unto me he that shall be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from the days of eternity." That of old this prophecy was understood by the church of the Jews to denote the place of the birth of the Messiah we have an illustrious testimony in the records of the Christian church, Matt. ii. 5, 6. Upon the demand of Herod where the Messiah should be born, the chief priests and scribes affirmed with one consent that he was to be born at Bethlehem, confirming their judgment by this place of the prophet. And afterwards, when they supposed that our Lord Jesus had been born in Galilee, because he lived there, they made this an argument against him, because he was not born, according to the Scripture, in Bethlehem, the town where David was, John vii. 41, 42. And we have the concurrence of their own testimony in this matter. So the Chaldee paraphrase renders these words, מִמֵּךְ לִי יֵצֵא לִהְיוֹת מוֹשֵׁל;—"Out of thee shall come forth to me the ruler:" מנך קדמי יפוק למהוי משיחא עביד שולטן;—"Out of thee shall come forth to me the Messiah, who shall have the dominion;" taking it for granted that he it is who is spoken of in this place. So also R. Solomon expounds the place: צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה ראוי היית להיות צעיר במשפחות אלפי יהודה מבכן פסלות רות המאביה שבך ממך לי יצא משיח בן דוד וכן הוא אומ" אבן מאסו, etc.;—"'Little to be in the thousands of Judah;' that is, thou deservest to be so, because of the profanation of Ruth the Moabitess, who was in thee. 'Out of thee shall come forth to me the Messiah, the son of David.' And so he saith, 'The stone which the builders refused.'" And though Kimchi seems to deny that the Messiah shall be born in Bethlehem, yet he grants that

it is he who is here prophesied of: "Out of thee shall come forth יצא לי משיח כי מזרע דוד שהיה מבית־לחם יהיה,"—"unto me the Messiah; for he shall be of the seed of David, who was of Bethlehem." He grants, I say, that it is the Messiah that is here prophesied of, though, against Rashi, the Targum, and the text, he would deny that he should be born in Bethlehem. But his interpretation is fond, and forced to serve the present turn, because the Jews know that the Lord Jesus was born there. God speaks to Bethlehem, the city of David, and gives an account how greatly he will magnify it beyond what it then seemed to deserve; and this he will do by raising out of and from that place (not merely from David, who was born at that place) the Messiah, who was to rule his people Israel. This, then, was the place of old designed for the birth of the Messiah, and there was our Lord Jesus born, at the appointed time, of the tribe of Judah and family of David. And there are sundry circumstances giving weight unto this consideration:—

18. First, Whereas the parents of Jesus were outwardly of a mean condition, and living in Galilee, it may be supposed that they were very little known or taken notice of to be of the lineage and offspring of David; nor, it may be, in their low estate, did they much desire to declare that which would be of no advantage, and perhaps of some hazard unto them: but now their coming unto Bethlehem, and that whether they would or no, upon the command of public authority, made their house and kindred known unto all the Jews, especially those of the family of David, who were then all of them gathered together in that place. Secondly, There is no just nor appearing reason to be given that should move the Roman emperor to decree that description and enrolment of persons which brought them unto Bethlehem. A matter it was of great charge and trouble to the whole empire, which at that time enjoyed the greatest peace and tranquillity; the temple of Janus was then shut, and all things in quietness in all parts of the world. Neither was there afterwards any public use made of that enrolment; nor is it certain that it was accomplished in any other nation. But the infinite, holy, wise Governor of all the world puts this into his mind, and incites him on this work, to set mankind into a motion, that two persons of low condition might be brought out of Galilee into Bethlehem, that Jesus might, according unto this prophecy, be born there. Thirdly, It is not likely that Joseph and Mary had any thoughts at that time about the place where the Messiah should be born, and so, probably, had not the least design of removing their habitation unto Bethlehem; or if they had so, yet their doing of it of their own accord might have given advantage unto the Jews to say that the mother of Jesus did not indeed any way belong unto Bethlehem, but only went thither to be delivered, that she might

report her son the better to be the Messiah. But by this admirable providence of God, all these, and sundry other difficulties of the like nature, are removed out of the way. Their minds are determined; a journey they must take,—and that at a time very unseasonable for the holy Virgin, when she was so near the time of her delivery,—and be publicly enrolled of the family of David, upon the command of him who never knew aught of that business, which yet none but himself could be instrumental to accomplish. Fourthly, Not long after this, that town of Bethlehem was utterly destroyed, nor hath been for a thousand and six hundred years either great or small among the thousands of Judah. And all these circumstances give much light unto this characteristical presignation of the person of the Messiah from the place of his birth or nativity

19. The exceptions of the Jews unto the evangelist's citation of the words of the prophet concern not the testimony itself, nor are, indeed, of any great importance; for,—First, The evangelist intended no more but only to direct unto that testimony which was given unto the nativity of the Messiah at Bethlehem, reciting so much of the words, and in such manner, as to prove by them that which he intended. He took not upon him to repeat every word as they were written by the prophet (which he might easily have done had he designed it, and that without the least disadvantage unto what he aimed at), but only to declare how the assertion was proved, that the Messiah was to be born at Bethlehem.

Secondly, He useth the words to no other purpose than that for which, by the Jews' acknowledgment, they were recorded by the prophet; neither, in the alterations that are made in this recital, is there one letter taken from the prophet's words or added unto them used by him to the advantage of his assertion: which is the whole that the utmost scrupulosist can require in the recital of the words of another by the way of testimony.

Thirdly, He seems not to repeat the words of the prophet himself immediately, but only to record the answer which, from these words of the prophet, was given unto Herod by the priests and scribes; so that the repetition of the words is theirs, and not his properly.

Fourthly, Whose soever the words are, as there is nothing in the whole of them discrepant from, much less contrary unto, those of the prophet,—nor are they used to signify any thing but the open, plain intention of the prophet,—so are all the particulars wherein a difference appears between them capable of a fair reconciliation. This we shall manifest by passing briefly through them:—

The first difference is in the first words: וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לֶחֶם אֶפְרָתָה,—"And thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah;" which are rendered in the evangelist, Καὶ σὺ Βεθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα,—"And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah." That Bethlehem which was of old called Ephratah, from

its first builder, 1 Chron. iv. 4, that name being now forgotten and worn out of use, is here said to be, as it was indeed, "in the land of Judah," to distinguish it from Bethlehem that was in the lot or land of Zebulun, as both Rashi and Kimchi observe, Josh. xix. 15; and, it may be, to denote withal the relation that the Messiah had to Judah. So that here there is no discrepancy. "Beth-lehem Ephratah," and "Bethlehem in the land of Judah," are one and the same name and place. Secondly, In the ensuing words there is more variety: צָעִיר לִהְיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי;—"Little to be in the thousands of Judah." In the evangelist, Οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· —"Art not the least among the leaders of Judah." צָעִיר, "parva," or "little," in the positive, is rendered by the evangelist ἐλαχίστη, in the superlative degree. The Hebrews have no superlative degree in their language, and therefore do often express the importance of it by the positive with בְּ following, as it doth in this place: צָעִיר בְּאַלְפֵי, —"Little in the thousands of Judah;" that is, the least of them, if the word be adjectively to be expounded.

אלפים, that is, χιλιάδες (as the word is rendered by the LXX.), is in the evangelist ἡγεμόνες, "princes, rulers, leaders." The Israelites, in their political order, were distributed into tens, hundreds, and thousands,—not unlike the distribution in our own country into tithings, hundreds, and counties; and each portion had its peculiar captain, ruler, or leader. According to this distribution, when there was a considerable number, a thousand or more, inhabiting together, they made a peculiar kind of town or city, which had its special chiliarch, or governor. And these were called the thousands of Israel or Judah, or places that had such a proportion of people belonging to them, and consequently such a special ruler of their own; which kind of rulers in the commonwealth were alone taken notice of, those others of tens and hundreds being under their government. So that "thousands" and "rulers" denote one and the same thing,—the one with respect unto the people, the other unto the governors of them.

The only ἐναντιόφανες is in the mode or manner of expression. The proposition in the prophet seems to be affirmative, "Thou art little." In the evangelist it is expressly negative, "Thou art not the least." But, first, This difference concerneth not the testimony as to that end for which it was produced. What way soever the words be interpreted, the importance of the testimony is still the same. Secondly, The words in the prophet contain no perfect enunciation, nor do yield any complete sense, unless it be on one of these two suppositions:—First, That the word צָעִיר is to be taken adverbially, and to signify not "parva," but "parum,"—not "a little one," but "a little;" and then they give us this sense, "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, it is but a little that thou shouldest be among the thou-

sands of Judah." And this hath no inconsistency with the words of the evangelist, "Thou art not the least;" for though it were eminent among the thousands of Judah, yet this was but a little or small matter in comparison of the honour that God would put upon it, by the birth of the Messiah. And this is not unusual in the Hebrew language. Adjectives feminine are frequently taken in the neuter gender, which it hath not, and signify adverbially. And though צָעִיר be of a masculine termination, yet being joined with בֵּית־לֶחֶם, the name of a town or city, it is put for צְעִירָה of the feminine gender. Or, secondly, An interrogation must be supposed to be included in the words, "Art thou but little?" "Beth-lehem, אַתָּה צָעִיר," "art thou but little?" which may well be rendered negatively, *οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη*,—"Thou art not the least among the thousands of Judah." The prophet, then, might have respect both to its present outward estate, which was mean and contemptible in the eyes of men, and also to the respect that God had unto it as to its future worth, which was to prefer it above all the thousands of Judah; which principally the evangelist had regard unto.

There is yet another solution of this difficulty added of late by a learned person (Pococke Miscellan. Not. cap. ii.), who makes it probable, at least, that the word צָעִיר is of the number of those that are used in a directly contrary sense: as קדש, to "sanctify" and "profane;" ברך, to "bless" and "curse;" נפש, "a living soul" and "a dead carcase." And he proves by notable instances that it signifies, as sometimes *ἐλάχιστος*, "least," so sometimes *οὐδαμῶς ἐλάχιστος*, "great, illustrious, and excellent."

The remaining differences are inconsiderable. The pronoun לִי, "to me," is omitted by the evangelist, and the reason of it is evident; for in the prophet God himself speaks in his own person, in the gospel the words are only historically recited. מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל, "Ruler in Israel," is paraphrased by the evangelist, *Ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ισραήλ*,—"The leader that shall feed my people Israel." Asserting his rule, he adds the manner of it,—he shall do it by feeding them; according as his rule is declared in the next words in the prophet, Micah v. 4, "He shall stand and feed in the strength of the LORD," which words the evangelist had respect unto. And this much have we spoken by the way, for the vindication of the recital of this testimony, whose application in general unto the matter in hand is every way unquestionable, and so yields us a second characteristical note of the person of the Messiah.

20 The *manner of the birth* of the Messiah, namely, that he should be "born of a virgin," is a third characteristical note given of him. The first promise doth sufficiently intimate that he was not to be brought into the world according to the ordinary course of mankind, by natural generation, seeing he was *διακριτικῶς*, and in

a peculiar manner designed to be the "seed of the woman;" that is, to be born of a woman, without conjunction of man. To make this sign yet the more evident, God gives it forth directly in a word of promise: Isa. vii. 10–16, "Moreover, the LORD spake again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the LORD thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above. But Ahaz said, I will not ask, neither will I tempt the LORD. And he said, Hear ye now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." This is the promise and prophecy, the accomplishment whereof in our Lord Jesus we have recorded, Matt. i. 22, 23, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel." Now, this being a thing utterly above the course of nature,—which never fell out from the foundation of the world unto that day, nor ever shall do so to the end of it, seeing the miraculous power of God shall no more in the like kind be exerted,—it is an infallible evidence and demonstrative note of the true Messiah. He, and he alone, was to be born of a virgin; so alone was Jesus of Nazareth: and therefore he alone is the true Messiah.

21. The Jews, being greatly pressed with this prophecy and the accomplishment of it, do try all means to escape by breaking through one of them; and we might expect that they would principally attempt the story of the evangelist, but circumstances on that side are so cogent against them that they are very faint in that endeavour. For if it was so indeed, that Jesus was not born of a virgin, as is recorded, and as both himself and his disciples professed, why did they not charge him with untruth herein in the days of his flesh? Why did they not call his mother into question, especially considering that she being espoused unto an husband, they might, upon conviction, have put her unto a public and shameful death? None of this being done or once undertaken by their forefathers, no less full of envy and malice against the person and doctrine of Jesus than themselves, and much better furnished and provided for such an undertaking, might any colour be given unto it, than they are, they insist not much upon the denial of the truth of the record. But to relieve themselves, they by all means contend that the words of the prophet are no way applicable unto the birth of our Lord Jesus, which the evangelist reports them prophetically to express; and to this end they multiply exceptions against our interpretation of the prophecy.

22. First, They deny that here is any thing spoken of the conception or bearing of a son by a virgin; for the word here used, say they (עַלְמָה), signifieth any young woman, married or unmarried, yea, sometimes an adulteress, as Prov. xxx. 19, so that the whole foundation of our interpretation is infirm; and the עַלְמָה here intended was, they say, no other but either the wife of the prophet, or the wife of Ahaz the king, or some young woman in the court then newly married or to be married to the king, or some other person.

Secondly, They say that the birth of this child, which the עַלְמָה, or young woman mentioned, was to conceive, was immediately to ensue, so as to be a sign unto Ahaz and the house of David of the deliverance promised unto them from the kings of Damascus and Samaria; and so could not be Jesus of Nazareth, whose nativity, happening seven hundred years after this, would be no pledge unto them of any thing that should shortly come to pass.

Thirdly, They insist that, Isa. vii. 16, it is promised that before that child which should be so conceived and born should come to the years of discretion, to "know to refuse the evil, and choose the good," the kings of Damascus and Samaria should be destroyed; now this came to pass within a few years after, and therefore can have no relation to the birth of Jesus of Nazareth.

Fourthly, They affirm that in the following chapter the accomplishment of this prophecy is declared, in the prophet's going in unto the prophetess, and her conceiving a son, concerning whom it is said, that before he should have knowledge to say, "My father, and my mother," the land should be forsaken of both her kings, in answer unto what is spoken of the child of the virgin, chap. vii. 16, viii. 1.

Fifthly, That the name of this child was to be Immanuel, whereas he of whom we speak was called Jesus, Matt. i. 21.

Sixthly, That the child here mentioned was to be fed and nourished with butter and honey; which cannot be spoken, nor is it written, of Jesus of Nazareth.

23. In answer unto these objections, some learned men have granted unto the Jews that these words of the prophet were literally fulfilled in some one *then a virgin*, and afterwards married in those days, and that they are only in a *mystical sense* applied by Matthew to the birth of the Lord Jesus; as, they say, are sundry other things that are spoken primarily of others in the Old Testament. But the truth is, this answer is neither safe in itself, nor needful as to the argument of the Jews, nor consistent with the sense of the place or truth of the words themselves. First, It is not safe as to the faith of Christians; for whereas the birth of the Messiah of a virgin was so signal a miracle, and so eminent a characteristical note of his person, if it be not directly foretold and prophesied of in this place,

there was no one prediction of it made unto the church of the Jews. Now, how this should seem reasonable, whereas things of far less concernment are foretold, is not easily made to appear.

Secondly, Upon this interpretation of the words, there is no ground left for the application of the mystical sense which they pretend to be made by Matthew: for if indeed the person primarily, directly, and literally spoken of, did not conceive a child whilst she was a virgin, but only that she who was then a virgin did afterwards, upon marriage, conceive in the ordinary course of nature, there remains no ground for the application of what is spoken concerning her unto one who, in and after her conception and the birth of her child, continued a virgin; for although it be not required that there be an agreement in all things between the type and the antitype, yet if there be no agreement between them in that wherein the one is designed to signify the other, they cannot on any account stand in that relation. David, as he was a king, was a type of Messiah the great King. There was, we know, not an absolute similitude in all things between David and him, nor was there any necessity that so there should be, that he might be his type; but yet if he had not been a king, he could have been no type of him at all in his kingdom. No more can any person here spoken of, unless she did conceive a son, and bring forth, continuing a virgin, be a type of her who was so to do; for how can the miraculous work of the conception of a virgin be signified or expressed by the ordinary conception of a woman in the state of wedlock? Besides, this answer is wholly needless as to the objection of the Jews, and inconsistent with the sense of the place, as will be seen in the consideration of the words themselves.

24. We have formerly evinced that the foundation and end of the Judaical church and state, and of the preservation of the Davidical family, was solely the bringing forth of the promised Messiah; and this the event hath fully demonstrated, in their utter rejection after the accomplishment of that end. And hence the promise of the Messiah was the foundation, cause, and reason of all other promises made unto that people, as to any mercy or privilege that as such they were to be intrusted withal; for that for whose sake they were a people must needs be the reason and cause of all good things that *as a people* were bestowed upon them. Thus, God often promiseth them to do this or that unto them for Abraham's sake, and David's sake; that is, upon the account of the promise of the Messiah signally made unto Abraham and David, when his bringing forth into the world was restrained unto their families and posterity. And hence, also, in times of straits and difficulties, when the people were pressed on every side, and laboured for deliverance, God oftentimes renewed unto them the promise of the Messiah; partly to support their spirits

with expectation of his coming, and the salvation that it should be accompanied withal; and partly to give them assurance that they should not be consumed or utterly perish under their calamity, because the great work of God by them, in bringing forth the Messiah, was not yet accomplished. So to this purpose the fourth chapter of this prophecy. And on this account it was, namely, of the temporal concernment of that people in the coming of the Messiah, that the promise of him was oftentimes mixed and interwoven with the mention of other things that were of present use and advantage unto them; so that it was not easy sometimes to distinguish the things that are properly spoken with reference unto him from those other things which respected what was present, seeing both sorts of them are together spoken of, and that to the same end and purpose.

25. Upon these principles, we may easily discover the true sense and importance of this prophetical prediction. Upon the infidelity of Ahaz, and the generality of the house of David with him, refusing a sign of deliverance tendered unto them, God tells them by his prophet that they had not only wearied his messengers by their unbelief and hypocrisy, but that they were ready to weary himself also, verse 13. He was even almost wearied with their manifold provocations during that typical state and condition wherein he kept them. However, for the present he had promised them deliverance; and although they had refused to *ask a sign* of him according unto his *command*, yet he would preserve them from their present fears of utter ruin, and in due time accomplish his great and wonderful intendment, and that in a miraculous manner, by causing *a virgin to conceive* and bring forth that son, on whose account they should be preserved. This is the ground of the promise of the Messiah in this place, even to give them assurance that they should be preserved from utter destruction, because they were to continue to enjoy their church and state until his coming; as also, to comfort and support them during their distresses with the hope and expectation of him: for with the thoughts of his coming do the Jews to this day relieve their spirits under their calamities, though they have had no *renewed promise* of him for near two thousand years. But how may it appear that it was the Messiah who should be thus born of a virgin? This the prophet assures them, by telling them, in his name, what he shall *be*, and *be called* accordingly: "He shall be called Immanuel," or "God with us." He shall be so both in respect of his person and office; for he shall *be* God and man, and he shall *reconcile* God and man, taking away the enmity and distance that was caused by sin. And this was such a description of the Messiah as by which he was sufficiently known under the old testament, yea, from the foundation of the world, as hath been before declared. And the prophet further assures them that this Immanuel shall be born

truly a man, and *dwell amongst them*, being brought up with the *common food* of the country, until he came, as other men, unto the years of discretion: "Butter and honey shall he eat, until he know to choose the good and refuse the evil." And this was enough for the consolation of believers, as also for the security of the people from the desolation feared. But yet, because all this discourse was occasioned by the war raised against Judah by the kings of Israel and Damascus, unto the promise of their deliverance God is pleased to add a threatening of judgment and destruction unto their adversaries; and because he would limit a certain season for the execution of his judgment upon them, as he had declared the safety and preservation of Judah to depend on the birth of Immanuel of a virgin, in the appointed season, so as to their enemies [he declares] that they should be cut off and destroyed before the time that *any child* not yet born could come to the years of discretion, "to refuse the evil and choose the good," verse 16. Now, that this is the true importance and meaning of the prophecy will evidently appear, in our vindication of it from the exceptions of the Jews (before laid down) against its application by Matthew unto the nativity of Jesus Christ.

26. First, They except that it is not a *virgin* that is here intended by עַלְמָה, which they say signifies *any young woman*, and sometimes an *adulteress*. This being the foundation of all their other objections, and on the determination whereof the whole controversy from this place dependeth, I shall fully clear the truth of what we assert; for, (1.) The Jews themselves will not deny but that if the conception of a virgin be intended, it must refer unto some other, and not to any in those days. עַלְמָה, the word here used, is from עָלַם, "to hide," or נֶעֱלַם, in Niphal, "hidden, kept close, reserved." Hence is that name of virgins, partly in general from their being unknown by man, and partly from the universal custom of the east, wherein those virgins who were of any esteem or account were kept hid and reserved from all public or common conversation. Hence by the Grecians, also, they are called *κατάκλειστοι*, "shut up," or recluses; and their first appearance in public they termed *ἀνακαλυπτήρια*, the season of bringing them out from the retirements wherein they were hid. The original signification of the word, then, denotes precisely a virgin, and cannot be wrested to a person living in the state of wedlock, much less unto a prostitute harlot, as the Jews pretend. (2.) The constant use of the word directs us to the same signification. It is seven times used in the Old Testament, and in every one of them doth still denote a virgin or virgins, either in a proper or metaphorical sense. The first time it is used is Gen. xxiv. 43, where Rebekah is said to be עַלְמָה, "a virgin." Verse 16, she is said to be בְּתוּלָה "a maid," and אִישׁ לֹא יְדָעָהּ, "a man had

not known her." So that עַלְמָה is בְּתוּלָה אֲשֶׁר אִישׁ לֹא יְדָעָ, "a maid that no man hath known;" that is, an unspotted virgin. And doubtless such a one, and no other, was intended by Abraham's servant for a wife unto Isaac, when he prayed that the הָעַלְמָה which came forth to the well might answer his token that he had fixed on. Again, it is used Exod. ii. 8, where Moses' sister, who called her mother unto Pharaoh's daughter, is termed עַלְמָה; and her age, being then probably not above nine or ten years old, with the course of her life in her mother's house, declares her sufficiently to have been a virgin. Once it is used in the Psalms in the plural number: Ps. lxviii. 26, בְּתוֹךְ עֲלָמוֹת תֹּפֵפוֹת;—"In the midst the virgins playing with timbrels;" where also none but virgins, properly so called, can be intended, for they were by themselves exercised to celebrate the praises of God in the great assembly. Twice is the word used in the same number, in a metaphorical sense, in the Canticles, and in both places it hath respect unto virgins: Chap. i. 3, "Therefore do the עֲלָמוֹת love thee;" that is, the virgins, as they do a desirable person, from whence the allusion is taken. And chap. vi. 8, the עֲלָמוֹת are distinguished first from מְלָכוֹת, the "queens," or the king's married wives; and then from the פִּילַגְשִׁים, or "concubines," those who were admitted "ad usum thori," to the marriage-bed, though their children did not inherit with those of the married wives: and therefore none but those who were properly virgins could be designed by that name. And by them are those denoted who keep themselves chaste unto Christ, and undefiled in his worship. Hence are they in the Revelation, chap. xiv. 4, said to be *παρθένοι*, "virgins," or *ἄμωμοι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, verse 5, "persons unblamable before the throne of God," having not defiled themselves with the spiritual fornications of the great whore. There remaineth only one place more wherein this word is used, whence the Jews would wrest somewhat to countenance their exceptions. This is Prov. xxx. 19, וְדֶרֶךְ גֶּבֶר בְּעַלְמָה;—"And the way of a man with a maid." And who is intended by עַלְמָה there, they say the ensuing words declare: כֵּן דֶּרֶךְ אִשָּׁה מְנָאָפֶת;—"So is the way of an adulteress," or a woman an adulteress, an harlot. So that עַלְמָה may, it seems, be such an one. But, [1.] Suppose the word should in this place be used in a sense quite contrary unto that of all other places wherein mention is made of it, is it equal that we should take the importance of it from this one *abuse*, rather than from the constant *use* of it in other places, especially considering that this place will by no means admit of that signification, as we shall immediately evince? [2.] It is used here peculiarly, with the prefix בְּ, בְּעַלְמָה, whence it is rendered by the LXX. in the abstract, Ἐν νεότητι, "The way of a man in his youth;" which sense Jerome follows, "Viam viri in adolescentia;" and it may thus seem to be differenced from the same word in all

other places. But, [3.] Indeed the meaning of the wise man is evident, and it is a virgin that he intended by the word, and דֶּרֶךְ גֶּבֶר בְּעַלְמָה is the way that a man taketh to corrupt a virgin, and to compass his lust upon her. This is secret, hidden, full of snares and evils, such as ought not to enter into the thoughts of a good man to conceive, much less to approve of. And therefore, whereas he says of the residue of the quaternion joined with this, verse 18, נִפְלְאוּ, "They are too wonderful for me," he adds, on the mention of this evil, לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, "I know it not," or as Jerome, "Penitus ignoro;" which he could not say of the way of natural generation. And by this means she who is called עַלְמָה, "a virgin," verse 19, is made אִשָּׁה מְנָאֲפֶת, "an harlot," verse 20, and has become impudent in sinning. A man having, by subtle wicked ways, prevailed against her chastity, and corrupted her virginity, she afterwards becomes a common prostitute. And this I take to be the genuine meaning of the place, though it be not altogether improbable that the wise man in verse 20 proceedeth unto another especial instance of things secret and hidden in an adulterous woman, כֵּן signifying as much as "so also," which it doth in sundry other places.

27. And these are all the places, besides that of the prophet under consideration, wherein the word is used in the Old Testament; so that as its rise, its constant use also will admit of no other signification but only that of an *unspotted virgin.* Besides, the LXX. render it in this place παρθένος, "a virgin," and the Targum, עלמתא, which the other Targums express a virgin by, Gen. xxiv. 16, 57; Esth. ii. 2, iv. 4; Ruth ii. 23; 1 Sam. xxv. 42. Neither is any word in the Scripture so constantly and invariably used to express an incorrupted virgin as this is. נַעֲרָה hath respect only unto *age*, and signifies any one, married or unmarried, a virgin or one defloured, so she be young. בְּתוּלָה also is used for one corrupted, Deut. xxii. 23, 24; as also for a widow, Joel i. 8. So that by this word a virgin is precisely signified, or the Hebrews have no word denoting exactly that state and condition. And, lastly, the prefixing of הָ in this place, הָעַלְמָה, makes the denotation of the word the more signal. It is but twice more so prefixed, Gen. xxiv. and Exod. ii.; in both which places the Jews themselves will not deny but that unspotted virgins are intended.

28. Further; there are other considerations offering themselves from the context undeniably proving that it is the conception of a virgin which is here intended and foretold; for, first, it is plainly some marvellous thing, above and contrary unto the ordinary course and operation of nature, that is here spoken of. It is called אות, a signal "prodigy;" and is given by God himself in the room of, and as something greater and more marvellous than, any thing that Ahaz could have asked, either in heaven above or in the earth beneath,

had he made his choice, according unto the tender made unto him. "The Lord himself shall give you a sign." The emphasis used in giving the promise denotes the marvellousness of the thing promised. Now, certainly it was no such great matter that the wife of Ahaz, which had before born him a son, who was now eight years of age, or the wife of the prophet, who was the mother of Shear-jashub, then present with his father, or any virgin then present immediately to be married, should bear a son, so as to have it called a "prodigy," an *eminent sign* of God's giving a thing that he should take upon his own power to perform, when within the same space of time hundreds of sons were born to other women in the same country. And it is ridiculous what the Jews pretend, namely, that it was great in this, that the prophet should foretell that conception, as also that it should be a son that should be born, and not a daughter; for the work and sign intimated doth not consist at all in the *truth* of the prophet's prediction, but in the *greatness* of the thing itself that was foretold.

29. The Jews cannot assign either virgin or son that is here intended. Some of them affirm that Alma was the wife of Ahaz, and the son promised was Hezekiah; but this is rejected by Kimchi himself, he acknowledging that Hezekiah was now eight years old, being born four years before his father came to the kingdom, in the fourth year of whose reign this promise was given unto him. Others would have the Alma to be the wife of the prophet, and the son promised to be Maher-shalal-hash-baz, whose birth is mentioned in the next chapter. But neither hath this any more colour of reason; for besides that his wife is constantly called נְבִיאָה, "the prophetess," and could on no account be termed עַלְמָה, "a virgin," having a son some years old, at that time accompanying his father, that son of hers in the eighth chapter is promised as a sign quite to another purpose, nor could for any reason be called עִמָּנוּאֵל, "Immanuel," whose the land should be, which is said to belong unto this promised child. And for what they, lastly, add concerning *some virgin* then standing by, who was shortly after to be married, it is as fond as any other of their imaginations; for besides that the prophet says not, הָעַלְמָה הַזֹּאת, "This virgin," as he would have done had he directed his speech unto any one personally present, it is a mere arbitrary invention, no way countenanced from the text or context, such as if men may be allowed in, it is easy for them to pervert the sense of holy writ at their pleasure. On all which considerations, it appeareth that none can possibly be intended in this promise but he whose birth was אוֹת, a miraculous "sign," as being born of עַלְמָה, "a virgin;" and who, being born, was עִמָּנוּאֵל, "God with us," both in respect of his person, uniting the natures of God and man in one, and of his office, reconciling God and man, that

God might dwell with us in a way of favour and grace; he whose the land should be in an everlasting kingdom.

30. I have insisted the longer on this particular, because it comprisetb all that the prophecy is cited for by the evangelist, and all that we are concerned in in it. This being proved and confirmed undeniably, that it is the Messiah whose birth is here foretold, as also that he was to be born of a virgin, all other passages, whatever difficulty we may meet withal in them, must be interpreted in answer thereunto. And we have showed before, that, by reason of the typical state and condition of that people, many of the promises of the Messiah were so mixed with things of their then present temporal concernment, that it is often a matter of some difficulty to distinguish between them. It is enough for us that we prove, unquestionably, that those passages which are applied unto him in the New Testament were spoken of him intentionally in the Old; which we have done in this place,—and what belonged unto the then present state of the Jews we are not particularly concerned in. However, we shall manifest, in answer to the remaining exceptions of the Jews, that there is nothing mentioned, in the whole prophecy, that hath any inconsistenoy with what we have declared, as to the sense of the principal point of it, nay, that the whole of it is excellently suited unto the principal scope, already vindicated.

31. That, then, which in the second place is objected by the Jews against our application of this place and prophecy to Jesus Christ is, that the birth of the child here promised was to be *a sign to Ahaz* and the house of David of their deliverance from the two kings who then waged war against them. And this, they say, the birth of the Messiah so many hundred years after could give them no pledge or assurance of. And,—(1.) We do not say that this was given them as a *peculiar sign* or token of their present deliverance. Ahaz himself had before refused such a sign. But God only shows the reason in general why he would not utterly cast them off, although they wearied him, but would yet deliver them as at other times; and this was because of that great work which he had to accomplish among them, which was to be signal, marvellous, and miraculous. And this he calls אות, "a sign," in its *absolute*, not *relative* sense, as denoting a work wonderful, such as sometimes he wrought to evidence his great power thereby. In this sense אותות, "signs," are joined unto מופתים, "prodigies," Deut. vi. 22, Jer. xxxii. 20, Neh. ix. 10, where the works so called were great and marvellous; not *signs formally* of any thing, unless it were of the wonderful power of God whereby they were wrought. So the miracles of our Saviour and the apostles, in the New Testament, are called σημεῖα, "signs," for the same and no other cause. And the word is thus absolutely used very often in the Old Testament.

(2.) Besides, that which is secondly alleged, that a thing that shall come to pass many ages after cannot be made a sign of that which was to be done many ages before, is not universally true. The thing itself in its *existence*, it is true, cannot be so made a sign, but it may in the *promise* and prediction of it. And many instances we have of things promised for signs, which were not to *exist* in themselves until after the accomplishment of the things whereof they were signs, as Exod. iii. 12; 1 Sam. ii. 34; Isa. xxxvii. 30; 1 Kings xxii. 25; God intending by them the confirmation of their faith who should live in the time of their actual accomplishment.

(3.) This sign had the truth and force of a promise, although it was not immediately to be put in execution; and that is the reason that the words here used are one of them, הָרָה, "conceive," in the preterperfect tense, the other, יֹלֶדֶת, in benoni, or participle of the present tense, to intimate the certainty of the event, as is usual in the prophetical dialect. Their assurance, then, from this sign consisted herein, that God informs them that, as surely as he would accomplish the great promise of bringing forth the Messiah, and would put forth his marvellous power therein, that he should be conceived and born of a virgin, so certain should be their present deliverance, which they so desired.

32. It is further insisted on by them, that the deliverance promised was to be wrought before the child spoken of should know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, or should come to years of discretion, verse 16; and what was this unto him that was to be born some hundreds of years after? *Ans.* (1.) That the הַנַּעַר mentioned verse 16 is the same with the הָעַלְמָה promised verse 14, doth not appear. The prophet, by the command of God, when he went unto the king with his message, took with him Shear-jashub his son, verse 3. This certainly was for some especial end in the word or message that he had to deliver, the child being then but an infant, and of no use in the whole matter, unless to be made an instance of something that was to be done. It is therefore probable that he was the הַנַּעַר, the young child, designed verse 16, before whose growing up to discretion those kings of Damascus and Samaria were to be destroyed. Or, (2.) The expression may denote the time of any child's being born, and coming to the maturity of understanding, and so, consequently, the *promised child.* 'In as short a space of time as this promised child, when he shall be born, shall come to know to refuse the evil and choose the good, shall this deliverance be wrought.'

33. Their remaining cavils are of little importance. The child intended chap. viii., was to be the son of the prophet and prophetess, and so not this child that was to be born of a virgin. Besides, he is plainly promised as a sign of other things than those treated of in

this chapter, yea, of things quite contrary unto them. Again, this child, they tell us, was to be called Immanuel, whereas the son of Mary was called יֵשׁוּעַ, or, as they maliciously write it, יֵשׁוּ. But this name is given to signify what he should be and do, and not what he should be commonly called. He was to be God and man in one person, to reconcile God and man,—to be every way Immanuel. And this kind of expression in the Scripture, when a thing is said to be "called" that which it is, the name denoting the being, nature, and quality of it, is so frequent that there is nothing peculiar in it as here used. See Isa. i. 26, viii. 3, ix. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6; Zech. viii. 3. The like also may be said to that which they except in the last place, namely, that they know not that Jesus of Nazareth was brought up with butter and honey, which is foretold concerning this child; for the expression signifies no more but that the child should be educated [*i.e.*, nourished] with the common food of the country, such as children were in those places and times nourished withal, it being the especial blessing of that land that it flowed with milk and honey. And thus have we asserted and vindicated the third characteristical note of the true Messiah. He was to be born of a virgin; which none but only our Lord Jesus ever was from the foundation of the world.

34. There remain yet other descriptive notes of the Messiah, consisting in what he was to *teach*, and *do*, and *suffer*,—all of them guiding the faith of the church unto our Lord Jesus, who in all things fully answered unto them all. I shall briefly pass through them, according unto our design and purpose, and begin with what he was to teach. This Moses directs us unto, giving that great predescription of him which we have, Deut. xviii. 18, 19, "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." This is that signal testimony concerning the Messiah which Philip urged out of Moses unto Nathanael, John i. 45; which Peter not only applies unto him, but declares that he was solely intended in it, Acts iii. 22, 23; and Stephen seals that application with his blood, chap. vii. 37. Neither do nor can the Jews deny that the Messiah was to be a prophet, or that he was promised unto the church in the wilderness in these words. But we shall consider the particulars of them.

35. Sundry things are here asserted by Moses concerning the Messiah; as,—(1.) In general, that he should be a "prophet," a teacher of the church, and not a king only. The Jews, indeed, who greedily desire the things which outwardly attend kingly power and dominion in this world, do principally fix their thoughts and expectations on his kingdom. The revelation of the will of God which was to be

made by him, they little desire or inquire after. But the common faith of their ancestors, from this and other places, was, that the Messiah was to be a prophet, and was to reveal unto the church the whole counsel of God, as we shall evince in our comment on the first words of the Epistle. (2.) That this prophet should be raised up unto them "from among their brethren." He shall be of the posterity of Abraham, and of the tribe of Judah, as was promised of old, or "made of them according unto the flesh," Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. So that, as to his original or extract, he was to be born in the level of the people. From among his brethren was he to be raised up unto this office of a prophet and teacher of the church. (3.) That he must be "like unto Moses." The words are plain in many places, that, in the ordinary course of God's dealing with that church, among the prophets there was none like unto Moses, neither before nor after him. Hence Maimonides, with his followers, conclude that nothing can ever be altered in their law, because no prophet was ever to arise of equal authority with him who was their lawgiver. But the words of the text are plain. The prophet here foretold was to be "like unto him" wherein he was peculiar and exempted from comparison with all other prophets, which were to build on his foundation, without adding any thing to the rule of faith and worship which he had revealed, or changing any thing therein. In that is the prophet here promised to be like unto him; that is, he was to be a *lawgiver* to the house of God, as our apostle proves and declares, Heb. iii. 1–5. And we have the consent of the most sober among the Jews to the same purpose. The words of the author of Sepher Ikharim, lib. iii. cap. x., are remarkable: ואי איפשר שלא יקום כמוהו לעולם או גדול ממנו שחרי מלך המשיח יהיה כמוהו או גדול ממנו אבל פירוש לא קם כמוהו אינו שלא יקום כמוהו לעולם אלא שלא קם כמוהו בתואר מה יחידי או רצה לומר שבכל אותו זמן שנמכו הנביאים אחריו עד שנפסקה הנבואה מהם לא קם כמוהו אבל בעתיד כבד ימצא כמוהו או גדול ממנו;—"It cannot be that there should not at some time arise a prophet like unto Moses, or greater than he; for Messiah the King should be like him, or greater than he: but thus these words, 'There arose none like him,' ought to be interpreted, not as though none should ever be like him, but that none should be like him as to some particular quality or accident; or, that in all the space of time wherein the prophets followed him until prophecy ceased, none should be like unto Moses, but hereafter there shall be one like him, or rather greater than he." This is that which we affirmed before. In the whole series of prophets that succeeded in that church, building on Moses' foundation, there was none like unto him; but the prophet here promised was to be so, and in other regards, as appears from other testimonies, far greater than he. This was of old their common faith, from this prediction of Moses. And wherein this likeness was to consist, our apostle declares at large in his third chapter.

Moses was the great lawgiver by whom God revealed his mind and will as to his whole worship, whilst the church-state instituted by him was to continue. Such a prophet was the Messiah to be, a lawgiver, so as to abolish the old and to institute new rites of worship; as we shall afterwards more fully prove and confirm. (4.) This raising up of a prophet like unto Moses declares that the whole will of God, as to his worship and the church's obedience, was not yet revealed. Had it so been, there would have been no need of a prophet like unto Moses, to lay new foundations, as he had done. Those who succeeded, building on what he had fixed, and therefore said not to be like unto him, would have sufficed. But there are new counsels of the will of God, as yet hid, to be finally and fully revealed by this prophet; and after his work is done, there is no intimation of any further revelation to ensue. (5.) The presence of God with this prophet in his work is set down. He would "put his words into his mouth," or "speak in him," as our apostle expresseth the same matter, Heb. i. 1, 2. And, lastly, his ministry is further described from the event with respect unto them who would not submit unto his authority, nor receive the law of God at his mouth. God would "require it" at their hands; that is, as these words are interpreted by Peter, they should be "cut off from among his people," or from being so. And this signal commination, in the accomplishment of it, gives light unto the whole prediction. Some of the Jews from these words have fancied unto themselves another great prophet, whom they expect, as they did of old, before the coming of the Messiah. So in their dealing with John the Baptist, they asked him whether he were Elias; which he denied, because, though he was promised under that name, yet he was not that individual person whom they looked for,—that is, the soul of Elias the Tishbite, as Kimchi tells us, with a body new created, like unto the former: whereon they further demand whether he were ὁ προφήτης, "the prophet" promised by Moses; which he also denies, because that prophet was no other than the Messiah, John i. 21. To this purpose also is it that the Spirit of the Lord is promised to rest upon the Messiah, to "make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD," that he might "not judge after the sight of his eyes," etc., Isa. xi. 3–5. So also chap. lxi. 1, 2. And from this great prophet were the isles of the Gentiles to receive the law, chap. xlii. 1–4. The sum of all is, the Messiah was to be a prophet, a "prophet like unto Moses,"—that is, a lawgiver,—one that should finally and perfectly reveal the whole will and counsel of God; and with that authority, that whosoever refused to obey him should be exterminated and cast out from the privilege of being reckoned among the people of God.

36. We are then, in the next place, to consider the accomplishment of this promise in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Now, this

the story of him and the event do abundantly testify. That he was a prophet, and so esteemed by the Jews themselves, until, through the envy of the scribes and Pharisees, and their own unwillingness to admit of the purity and holiness of his doctrine, they were stirred up to oppose and persecute him,—as they had done all other prophets who, in their several generations, foretold his coming,—is evident from the records of the evangelical story. See John vi. 14, vii. 40; Acts iii. 22, 23. Their present obstinate denial hereof is a mere contrivance, to justify themselves in their rejection and murder of him. But this is not all. He was not only a prophet in general, but he was that prophet who was foretold by Moses and by all the prophets who built on his foundation, who was to put the last hand unto divine revelation, in a full declaration of the whole counsel of God,—the peculiar work of the Messiah. And this we shall evince in the ensuing considerations of his doctrine and prophecy, with the success and event of them.

37. First, The *nature of the doctrine* taught by this prophet gives testimony unto our assertion. Whatever characters of that truth which is holy and heavenly can rationally be conceived or apprehended, they are all eminently and incomparably imprinted on the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Whatever tends to the glory of God, as the first cause and last end of all things; as the only sovereign ruler, judge, and disposer of all; as the only infinitely holy, wise, righteous, good, gracious, merciful, powerful, faithful, independent Being,—is clearly, evidently, and in a heavenly manner, revealed therein. Whatever is useful or suitable to excite and improve all that is good in man, in the notions of his mind or inclinations of his will; and to discover his wants and defects, that he may not exalt himself in his own imagination above his state and condition: whatever is needful to reveal unto him his end or his way, his happiness or the means conducing thereunto: whatever may bring him into a due subjection unto God and subordination unto his glory: whatever may teach him to be useful in all those relations wherein he may be cast, within the bounds and compass of the moral principles of his nature, as a creature made for society: whatever is useful to deter him from and suppress in him every thing that is evil, even in those hidden seeds and embryos of it which lie beneath the first instances that reason can reach unto the discovery of, and that in an absolute universality, without the least indulgence, on any pretence whatever; and to stir him up, provoke him unto, and direct him in, the practice of whatever thing is true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, that is virtuous or praiseworthy, that may begin, bound, guide, limit, finish, and perfect, the whole system of moral actions in him in relation unto God, himself, and others:—it is all revealed, confirmed, and ratified, in the doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It hath

stood upon its trial above sixteen hundred years in the world, challenging the wit and malice of its adversaries to discover any one thing, or any circumstance of any thing, that is untrue, false, evil, uncomely, not useful or not convenient in it; or to find out any thing that is morally good, virtuous, useful, praiseworthy, in habit or exercise, in any instances of operations, in any degree of intension of mind, any duty that man owes to God, others, or himself, that is not taught, enjoined, encouraged, and commanded by it; or to discover any motives, encouragements, or reasons, unto and for the pursuit of that which is good and the avoidance of evil, that are true, real, solid, and rational, which it affordeth not unto them that embrace it. This absolute perfection of the doctrine of this prophet, joined with those characters of divine authority which are enstamped on it, doth sufficiently evidence that it contains the great, promised, full, final revelation of the will of God, which was to be given forth by the Messiah. Add hereunto, that since the delivery of this doctrine, the whole race of mankind hath not been able to invent or find out any thing that, without the most palpable folly and madness, might be added unto it, much less stand in competition with it, and it will itself sufficiently demonstrate its author.

38. Secondly, We have declared, in the entrance of this discourse, that the *Messiah was the means promised* for the delivery of mankind from that woful estate of sin and misery whereinto they had cast themselves. This was *declared* unto all in general; this *they believed* whom God graciously enabled thereunto. But how this deliverance should be wrought in particular by the Messiah; how the works of the devil should be destroyed; how God and man should be reconciled; how sinners might recover a title unto their lost happiness, and be brought to an enjoyment of it,—this was unknown not only unto all the sons of men, but also to all the angels in heaven themselves. Who, then, shall unfold this mystery, which was hid in the counsel of God from the foundation of the world? It was utterly beyond the reason and wisdom of man to give any tolerable conjecture how these things should be effected and brought about; but all this is fully declared by this prophet himself. In his doctrine, in what he taught, doth this great and hidden mystery of the reconciliation and salvation of mankind open itself gloriously to the minds and understandings of them that believe, whose eyes the god of this world hath not blinded,—and to them alone; for although this promise of the Messiah was all that God gave out unto Adam, and by him unto his posterity, to keep their hopes alive in their miserable condition in the earth, yet such was its obscurity, that, meeting with the minds of men full of darkness, and hearts set upon the pursuit of their lusts, it was, as to the substance of it, utterly lost to the greatest part of mankind. Afterwards the thing itself was again

retrieved unto the faith and knowledge of some, by new revelations and promises; only the manner of its accomplishment was still left hid in the depths of the bosom of the Almighty. But, as we said, by the preaching of Jesus both the thing itself and the manner of it are together brought to light, made known, and established beyond all the power of Satan to prevail against it. This was the work of the promised prophet, this was done by Jesus of Nazareth; who is therefore both Lord and Christ.

39. Thirdly, We have also declared how God, in his wisdom and sovereignty, *restrained the promise unto Abraham and his posterity*, shadowing out among them the accomplishment of it in Mosaical rites and institutions; and these also received manifold explications by the succeeding prophets. From the whole, a system of worship and doctrine did arise, which turned wholly on this hinge of the promised Messiah, relating in all things to the salvation to be wrought by him. But yet the will and mind of God was in this whole dispensation so folded and wrapped up in types, so veiled and shadowed by carnal ordinances, so obscured and hid in allegorical expressions, that the bringing of it forth unto light, the removal of the clouds and shades that were cast upon it, with a declaration of the nature, reason, and use of all those institutions, was a work no less glorious than the very first revelation of the promise itself. This was that which was reserved for the great prophet, the Messiah; for that God would prescribe ordinances and institutions unto his church, whose full nature, use, and end, should be everlastingly unknown unto them, is unreasonable to imagine. Now, this is done in the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ. The spiritual end, use, and nature, of all those sacrifices and typical institutions,—which, unto them who were conversant only with their outside, servile performance, were an insupportable yoke of bondage, as the Jews find them unto this day, being never able to satisfy themselves in their most scrupulous attendance unto them,—are all made evident and plain, and all that was taught by them accomplished. This was the work of the prophet like unto Moses. He fulfilled the end and unveiled the mind of God in all those institutions. And he hath done it so fully, that whoever looks upon them through his declaration of them cannot but be amazed at the blindness and stupidity of the Jews, who, rejecting the revelation of the counsel of God by him, adhere pertinaciously unto that whereof they understand aright no one tittle or syllable; for there is not the meanest Christian, who is instructed in the doctrine of the gospel, but can give a better account of the nature, use, and end, of Mosaical institutions, than all the profound rabbins in the world either can or ever could do, he that is least in the kingdom of God being greater in his light and knowledge than John Baptist himself, who yet was not behind any

of the prophets that went before him. This, I say, is that which the promised prophet was to do; and, moreover, he was to add the institutions of his own immediate revelation, even as Moses had given them the law of ordinances of old. And in this super-institution of new ordinances of worship, thereby superseding those instituted by Moses, was he like unto him, as was foretold.

40. Lastly, The event confirms the application of this character unto the Lord Jesus. Whosoever would not receive the word of this prophet, God threatens to "require it of him;" that is, as themselves confess, to exterminate him from among the number of his people, or to reject him from being so. Now, this was done by the body of the Jewish nation. They received him not, they obeyed not his voice. And what was the end of this their disobedience? They who, for their despising, persecuting, killing the former prophets, were only corrected, chastened, afflicted, and again quickly recovered out of the worst and greatest of their troubles, upon their rejection of him and disobedience unto his voice, are cut off, destroyed, exterminated from the place of their solemn worship, and utterly rejected from being the people of God. Whatever may be conceived to be contained in the commination against those who disobey the voice of that prophet promised, is all of it, to the full and in its whole extent, come upon the Jews, upon and for their disobedience unto the doctrine of Jesus of Nazareth: which, added unto the foregoing considerations, undeniably prove him to have been that prophet.

41. There is yet another character given of the Messiah in the Old Testament,—namely, in what he was to *suffer* in the world in the discharge of his work and office. This being that wherein the main foundation of the whole was to consist, and that which God knew would be most contrary to the apprehension and expectation of that carnal people, is, of all other notes of him, most clearly and fully asserted. The nature and effects of the sufferings of the Messiah, and how they were to be satisfactory to the justice of God (without which apprehension of them little or nothing of the promise or of Mosaical institutions can rightly be understood), because we must treat of them in our explication of the Epistle itself, shall not here be insisted on. It is sufficient unto our present intention that we prove that the Messiah was to suffer, and that, as many other miseries, so *death* itself. And this his suffering is foretold as a character to know and discern him by. That Jesus of Nazareth, by so many other demonstrations and evident tokens proved to be the Messiah, did also suffer the utmost that could be inflicted on a man, and in particular the things and evils which the Messiah was to undergo, we shall not need to prove. The Jews confess it, and even glory that their forefathers were the instrumental cause of his sufferings. Neither doth it at present concern us to declare what

he suffered from God himself, what from man, what from Satan, in his life and death, in his soul and body, and all his concernments; it being abundantly sufficient unto our present purpose that he suffered all manner of miseries, and lastly death itself, and that not for himself but for the sins of others.

42. The first evident testimony given hereunto is in Ps. xxii., from the beginning to the 22d verse. That *sufferings*, and those very great and inexpressible, are treated of in this psalm the Jews themselves confess, and the matter is too evident to be denied. That dereliction of God, tortures and pains in body and soul, revilings, mockings, with cruel death, are sufferings, is certain; and they are all here foretold. Again, it is evident that some *individual person* is designed as the subject of those sufferings. Most of the Jews would interpret this psalm of the *body of the people*, to whom not one line in it can be properly applied; for besides that the person intended is spoken of singularly throughout the whole prophecy, he is also plainly distinguished from all the people, of what sort soever;—from the evil amongst them, who reviled and persecuted him, verses 7, 8; and from the residue, whom he calls his "brethren" and the "congregation" of Israel, verse 22. It cannot, then, be the congregation of Israel that is spoken of; for how can the congregation of Israel be said to declare the praises of God before the congregation of Israel? which is the sum of Kimchi's exposition. Some of them, from the title of the psalm, עַל־אַיֶּלֶת הַשַּׁחַר, "For the hind of the morning," would have it to be a prophecy of Esther, who appeared as beautiful as the morning in the deliverance of Israel. But as the title is of another importance, respecting the nature of the psalm, not the person treated of in it, so they are not able to apply one verse or word in it unto her. Others of them plead that it is David himself who is intended; and this is not without some shadow of truth, for David might in some things propose his own afflictions and sufferings as types of the sufferings of the Messiah. But there are many things in this psalm that cannot be applied unto him absolutely. When did any open their lips and shake their heads at him, using the words mentioned, verse 8? When was he, or his blood, poured forth like water, and all his bones disjointed, verse 14? When were his hands and feet pierced, verse 16? When did any part his garments, and cast lots on his vesture, verse 18? When was he brought to the dust of death, before his last and final dissolution, verse 15? And yet all these things were to be accomplished in the person of him who is principally treated of in this psalm.

43. This whole psalm, then, is a prophecy of the Messiah, and absolutely of no other, as may further be evidenced from sundry passages in the psalm itself: for, first, It treats of one in whom the welfare of the whole church was concerned; they are, therefore, all

of them invited to praise the Lord on his account, and for the event and success of his sufferings, which they had the benefit of, verses 22, 23. Secondly, It is he by whom "the meek shall be satisfied," and obtain life eternal, verse 26. Thirdly, Upon his sufferings, as the event and success of them, the Gentiles are to be gathered in unto God: Verse 27, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." And this, by the confession of the Jews, is the proper work of the Messiah, to be effected in his days, and by him alone. Fourthly, The preaching of the truth and righteousness and faithfulness of God in his promise unto all nations, that is, of the gospel, ensues on the sufferings described, verse 31; which they also acknowledge to belong unto his days. So that it is the Messiah, and he alone, who is absolutely and ultimately intended in this psalm.

44. Now, the whole of what is here prophesied was so exactly fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, in all the instances of it, that it appears to be spoken directly of him, and no other. The *manner* of his suffering is scarcely more clearly expressed in the story of it by the evangelists than it is here foretold by David in prophecy; and therefore many passages out of this psalm are expressed by them in their records. He it was who, pressed with a sense of God's dereliction, cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" he it was that was accounted a worm and no man, and reviled and reproached accordingly; at him did men wag their heads, and reproach him with his trust in God; his bones were drawn out of joint by the manner of his sufferings; his hands and feet were pierced; and upon his vestures lots were cast; upon his suffering were the truth and promises of God declared and preached unto all the world: so that it is his *suffering* alone which is beforehand described in this psalm.

45. But the Jews except against our application of this psalm unto the Lord Jesus, as they imagine, from our own principles, and greatly triumph in their supposed advantage,—indeed in their own blindness and ignorance. "Jesus," they tell us, "in the opinion of Christians, was God; and how can these things be spoken of God? How could God cry out, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' how could men pierce the hands and feet of God?" And sundry of the like queries are made by Kimchi on the several passages of this psalm. But we know of how slender importance these things are. He who suffered was God, but he suffered not *as* God, nor in that wherein he was God; for he was *man* also, and *as* man, and in that wherein he was man, did he suffer. But their ignorance of the *union of the divine and human natures* in the person of Christ, each nature preserving its distinct properties and operations, is a thing which they would by no means be persuaded to part withal,

because it stands them, as they suppose, in great stead, as furnishing them with those weak and pitiful objections that they use to make against the gospel.

46. We have yet another *signal testimony* unto the same purpose, Isa. liii. As the outward manner of the sufferings of the Messiah, with their actings who were instrumental therein, is principally considered in Ps. xxii., so the inward nature, end, and effect of them, are declared in this prophecy. There are also sundry passages relating unto the covenant between the Lord Christ and his Father, for the carrying on of the work of redemption by this way of suffering; which the ancient Jews, not understanding his personal subsistence before his incarnation, referred unto his soul, which they imagined to have been created at the beginning of the world. Nor is there any prophecy that fills the present rabbins with more perplexities, or drives them to more absurdities and contradictions. It is not our present business to explicate the particular passages of this prophecy, or to make application of them unto the Messiah. It hath been done already by sundry learned men; and we also have cast our mite into this treasury on another occasion. That which we insist on is obvious to all,—namely, that *dreadful sufferings* in soul and body, and that from the will and good pleasure of God, for ends expressed in it, are here foretold and declared. Our inquiry is only after the person spoken of; for whoever he be, the Jews will not deny but that he was to suffer all sorts of calamities. That it is the Messiah, and none other, we have not only the evidence of the text and context, and nature of the subject-matter treated of, with the utter impossibility of applying the things spoken of unto any other person, without the overthrow of the whole faith of the ancient church, but also all the advantage from the confession of the Jews that can be expected or need to be desired from adversaries. For,—

47. First, The most *ancient* and best records of their judgment expressly affirm the person spoken of to be the Messiah. This is the Targum on the place; which themselves esteem of unquestionable, if not of divine authority. The spring and rise of the whole prophecy, as the series of the discourse manifests, is in verse 13 of chap. lii.; and there the words, הִנֵּה יַשְׂכִּיל עַבְדִּי, "Behold my servant shall prosper," or "deal wisely," are rendered by Jonathan, הא יצלח עבדי משיחא, "Behold my servant the Messiah shall prosper." And among others, the 5th verse of chap. liii. is so paraphrased by him as that none of the Jews will pretend any other to be intended: והו יבני בית מקדשנא דאתחל בחובנא אתמסר בעויתנא ובאלפנה שלמא יסני עלנא ונדנתינהי לפתנמוהו חובנא ישתבקון לנא;—"And he shall build the house of our sanctuary, which is profaned for our sins and delivered for our iniquities; and in his doctrine shall peace be multiplied unto us: and when we obey his word, our sins shall be forgiven us:" wherein

though he much perverts the text, yet [it is] to give us that sense which, by their own confession, is applicable only to the Messiah; whereby, as by other parts of his interpretation, he stopped the way unto the present rabbinical evasions. The translation of the LXX. they have formerly avouched as their own; and this also plainly refers the words to the Messiah and his sufferings, though somewhat more obscurely than it is done in the original.

In the Talmud itself, Tractat. Sanhed. Dist. Chelek, among other names they assign unto the Messiah, חוליא is one; because it is said in this place, אכן חלינו הוא נשא,—"Truly he bore our infirmity." We have their ancient rabbins making the same acknowledgment. To this purpose they speak in Bereshith Rabba on Gen. xxiv. 17: "This is Messiah the King, who shall be in the generation of the wicked, and shall reject them, and choose the blessed God and his holy name, to serve him with his whole heart." ונתן את לבו לבקש רחמים בעד ישראל לצום ולהתענות בעדם;—"And he shall set his heart to seek mercy for Israel, to fast, and to humble himself for them." שכ׳ והוא מחלל מפשעינו;—"As it is said, Isa. liii., 'He was wounded for our transgressions." וביישראל הוטאים הוא מבקש עליהן רחמים שכ׳ וובחבורתו נרפא־לנו;—"And when Israel sinneth, he seeketh mercy for them; as it is said again, 'And by his stripes are we healed.'" So Tanchuma on verse 13, chap. lii.: זה מלך משיח,—"This is King Messiah." And not to repeat more particular testimonies, we have their full confession in Alshech on the place, with which I shall close the consent: הנה רזל׳ פה אחד קיימו וקבלו על מלך משיח;—"Behold, our masters, of blessed memory, with one consent determine, according as they received by tradition, that it is concerning Messiah the King that these words are spoken." And therefore Abarbanel himself, who of all his companions hath taken most pains to corrupt and pervert this prophecy, confesseth that all their ancient wise men consented with Ben Uzziel in his Targum. So that we have as full a suffrage unto this character of the Messiah from the Jews themselves as can be desired or expected.

48. We have strength, also, added unto this testimony by the *weakness of the opposition* which at present they make unto our application of this place unto the Messiah. It is rather rage than reason that here they trust unto, and seem to cry, "Pereant et amici, dummodo et inimici pereant." Let Targum, Talmud, Cabbal tradition, former masters, be esteemed liars and deceived, so that Christians may be disappointed. New expositions and applications of this prophecy they coin, wherein they openly contradict one another, —yea, the same man (as Abarbanel) sometimes contradicts himself! and when they have done, they suggest such things as are utterly inconsistent with the faith of the ancient church concerning the Messiah, with follies innumerable, no way deserving our serious con-

sideration. The chief things which they most confide in we shall speedily remove out of our way.

(1.) Some of them say that this prophecy indeed concerneth the Messiah, but not Messiah Ben David, who shall be always victorious; but Messiah Ben Joseph, who shall be slain in battle against Gog and Magog. But,—[1.] This figment wholly overthrows the faith of the true Messiah, and they may as well make twenty as two of them. [2.] That Ben Joseph, whom they have coined in their own brains, is to be a great warrior from his first appearance, and after many victories is to be slain in a battle, or at least be reputed so to be; but this prophecy is concerning a man poor, destitute, despised, afflicted all his life, bound, imprisoned, rejected, scorned, condemned, and slain under a pretence of judgment,—no one thing whereof they do or can ascribe unto their Ben Joseph.

(2.) Others feign that the true Messiah was born long ago, and that he lives amongst the leprous people at the gates of Rome, being himself leprous and full of sores; which, as they say, is foretold in this prophecy! Such monstrous imaginations as these might not be repeated without some kind of participation in the folly of their authors, but that poor immortal souls are ruined by them, and that they evidence what a foolish thing man is when left unto himself, or judicially given up to blindness and unbelief. We are ready to admire at the senseless stupidity of their forefathers (they do so themselves), who chose to worship Baal and Moloch rather than the true God, who had so eminently revealed himself unto them; but it doth no way exceed that of those who have lived since their rejection of the true Messiah, nor do we need any other instance than that before us to make good our observation. And yet neither doth this prodigy of folly, this leprosy, in any thing answer the words of the prophecy, nor, indeed, hath any countenance from any one word therein, that single word they reflect upon signifying any kind of infirmities, or sorrows in general.

(3.) Some of them apply this prophecy to Jeremiah, concerning whom Abarbanel affirms, and that truly, that no one verse or line in the whole can with any colourable pretence be applied unto him; which also I have in particular manifested on another occasion. Himself applies it two ways:—[1.] To Josiah; [2.] To the whole body of the people, contradicting himself in the exposition of every particular instance, and the truth in the whole. But it is the whole people, in their last desolation, that they chiefly desire to wrest this prophecy unto. But this is,—[1.] Contrary to the testimony of their Targum and Talmud, all their ancient masters, and some of the wisest of their later doctors: [2.] To their own principles, profession, and belief; for whereas they acknowledge that their present misery is continued on them for their sins, and that if they could but re-

pent and live to God, their Messiah would undoubtedly come, this place speaks of the perfect innocency and righteousness of him that suffers, no way on his own account deserving so to do; which if they once ascribe unto themselves, their Messiah being not yet come, they must for ever bid adieu to all their expectations of him: [3.] Contrary to the express words of the text, plainly describing *one individual person:* [4.] Contrary to the context, distinguishing the people of the Jews from him that was to suffer by them, among them, and for them, verses 3–6: [5.] Contrary to every particular assertion and passage in the whole prophecy, no one of them being applicable unto the body of the people. And all these things are so manifest unto every one who shall but read the place with attention and without prejudice, that they stand not in need of any further confirmation. Hence Johannes Isaac confesseth that the consideration of this place was the means of his conversion.

49. Again; The whole work promised from the foundation of the world to be accomplished by the Messiah is here ascribed unto the person treated of and his sufferings. Peace with God is to be made by his chastisement, verse 5; and healing of our wounds by sin is by his stripes. He bears the iniquity of the church, verse 6, that they may find acceptance with God. In his hand the pleasure of the Lord for the redemption of his people was to prosper, verse 10; and he is to justify them for whom he died, verse 11. If these and the like things here mentioned may be performed by any other, the Messiah may stay away; there is no work for him to do in this world. But if these are the things which God hath promised that he shall perform, then he, and none other, is here intended.

50. Neither are the cavils of the Jews about the application of some expressions unto the Lord Jesus worth the least consideration: for besides that they may all of them be easily removed, the whole being exactly accomplished in him, and his passion set forth beyond any instance of a prophetic description of a thing future in the whole Scripture, let them but grant that the *true and only Messiah* was to converse among the people in a despised, contemned, reproached condition; that he was to be rejected by them; to be persecuted; to suffer; to bear our iniquities, and that from the hand of God; to make his soul an offering for sin, by that means spiritually to redeem and save his people,—and as themselves know well enough that there is an end of this controversy, so the Lord Jesus must and will on all hands be acknowledged to be the true and only Messiah.

51. But that we may not seem to avoid any of the pretences or exceptions that they make use of when they are pressed with this testimony, I shall briefly consider what their later masters,—who think themselves wiser than the authors of their Targum and Talmud and all their ancient doctors, who with one consent acknowledge the

Messiah to be intended in this prophecy, and wrest it unto the *people of the Jews* themselves, unto whom not one line or word of it is applicable,—do object unto our interpretation of the place. First, then, They say, it is not the prophet from the Lord, nor in the persons of the people of the Jews, but the *kings of the earth* which formerly had afflicted them, who are mentioned, chap. lii. 15, who utter and speak the words of this chapter, in an admiration of the blessed estate that the Jews shall at length attain unto. *Ans.* Any man that shall but view the context will easily see the shameful folly of this evasion; for,—(1.) Where is there any instance in the whole Scripture of the like introduction of *aliens and foreigners*, and the prophet's personating of them in what they say? and why should such a singular imagination here take place? (2.) How could they say, "Who hath believed our report," or the doctrine that we had heard and taught concerning this person, or these persons? Had the kings and nations so preached the misery and happiness ensuing of the people of the Jews, that they are forced to complain of the incredulity of men, that they would not believe them? And who would not believe them? The Jews?—they believe it well enough. The nations and their kings?—they are supposed to be the men complaining that they are not believed. So that the foulness of this imagination is beyond expression. (3.) How can they say, "For the transgression of my people was he stricken?" verse 8. Who are *they*, when the people themselves are supposed to speak? In brief, let all the Jews in the world find out one expression in the whole prophecy tolerably suited unto this hypothesis of theirs, and I shall be contented that the whole of it be granted unto them and be used according to their desires.

52. Secondly, They add, that the subject of this prophecy is spoken of in the plural number, and so cannot intend any one singular person. This they endeavour to prove from these words of the Lord, verse 8, מִפֶּשַׁע עַמִּי נֻגַּע לָמוֹ; which they render, "A transgressione populi mei plaga illa." "'Lamo' is of the plural number, and so cannot respect any single person, but must denote the whole people." *Ans.* (1.) But what perverseness is this! Whoever is intended in this prophecy, he is spoken of twenty times as a single person, and such things spoken of him as can by no artifices be suited unto any collective body of people; and shall one expression in the plural number outweigh all these, and be made an engine to pervert the whole context, and to render it unintelligible? (2.) Suppose yet the word to denote *many*, a *people*, and not one single person, will it not unavoidably follow that here is mention interserted occasionally of some other persons besides him who is the principal subject of the prophecy; and so the sense can be no other but that the people of the prophet, that is the Jews, should assuredly be punished for their

rejection of him whose person and work he prophesied about. (3.) The truth is, the word hath not necessarily a plural signification. לָמוֹ, "lamo," is most frequently put for לוֹ by the insertion of מ, whereof we have sundry instances in the Scriptures: Gen. ix. 26, "Blessed be the LORD God of Shem," וִיהִי כְנַעַן עֶבֶד לָמוֹ,—"and Canaan shall be his servant." "Lamo" for "lo." Job xx. 23, "God shall cast the fury of his wrath upon him," וַיַּמְטֵר עָלֵימוֹ בְּלַחְמוֹ,—"and shall rain it upon him whilst he is eating." עָלֵימוֹ for עָלָיו. So again the same word is used, chap. xxii. 2. Ps. xi. 7, "The righteous LORD loveth righteousness;" יָשָׁר יָחֲזוּ פָּנֵימוֹ,—"his countenance doth behold the upright." פָּנֵימוֹ for פָּנָיו. And in this prophet, chap. xliv. 15, "He maketh it a graven image," וַיִּסְגָּד־לָמוֹ,—"and he falleth down to it." "Lamo" for "lo." And this is so known that there is scarce any grammarian of their own who hath not taken notice of it: so that this exception also is evidently impertinent.

53. They yet urge further these words, verse 10, "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days." "This," say they, "is not agreeable unto any but those who have children of their bodies begotten, in whom their days are prolonged." *Ans.* (1.) It were well if they would consider the words foregoing, of his making his "soul an offering for sin,"—that is, dying for it,—and then tell us how he that doth so can see his carnal seed afterwards, and in them prolong his days. (2.) He that is here spoken of is directly distinguished from the seed, that is, the people of God; so that they cannot be the subject of the prophecy. (3.) It is not said that he shall prolong his days in his seed, but he himself shall prolong his days after his death; that is, upon his resurrection he shall live eternally, which is called length of days. (4.) The seed here are the seed spoken of Ps. xxii. 30, "A seed that shall serve the Lord, and shall be accounted unto him for a generation,"—that is, a spiritual seed; as the Gentiles are called the children of Zion, brought forth upon her travailing, Isa. lxvi. 8. Besides, how the Messiah shall obtain this seed is expressed in the next verse: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many." They are such as are converted to God by his doctrine, and justified by faith in him. And that disciples should be called the "seed," the offspring, the children, of their masters and instructors, is so common among the Jews and familiar unto them, that no phrases or expressions are more in use. Thus speaks expressly this prophet also, chap. viii. 18, "Behold, I and the children whom the LORD hath given me." And who were his children he declares, verse 16, "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." These were the "children" whom the Lord had given him. And this is the sum of all that which, with any appearance of reason, is objected against our application of this place unto the Messiah; which how weak and trivial it is, is obvious unto every ordinary understanding.

54. We may yet add some other testimonies to the same purpose. Daniel tells us, chap. ix. 26, יִכָּרֵת מָשִׁיחַ,—"Messiah shall be cut off," that is, "from the land of the living;" and that "not for himself." And, Zech. ix. 9, it is said he shall be עָנִי, "poor," and in his best condition "riding on an ass;" which place is interpreted by Solomon Jarchi and others of the Messiah. He was also to be "pierced," chap. xii. 10, being the "shepherd," chap. xiii. 7,—the מלכא, the "king," as the Targum,—that was to be smitten with the sword of the Lord; the "judge of Israel," that was to be "smitten with a rod upon the cheek," Mic. iv. 1;—all denoting his persecution and suffering.

55. Agreeably unto these testimonies, the Jews themselves have a tradition about the *sufferings of the Messiah*, which sometimes breaks forth amongst them. In Midrash Tehillim on Ps. ii., "Rabbi Hana, in the name of Rabbi Idi, says that the Messiah must bear the third part of all the afflictions that shall ever be in the world." And R. Machir, in Abkath Rochel, affirms that "God inquired of the soul of the Messiah, at the beginning of the creation, whether he would endure sufferings and afflictions for the purging away the sins of his people; to which he answered, that he would bear them with joy" And that these sufferings of the Messiah are such, as that without the consideration of them no rational account can be given of any of their services or sacrifices, shall in our Exposition be fully declared. Now, upon these testimonies, it is evident that the great argument used by the Jews to disprove Jesus of Nazareth from being the true Messiah,—namely, his meanness, poverty, persecutions, and sufferings in this world,—doth strongly confirm the truth of our faith that he only was so indeed.

56. Unto these characters given of the Messiah we may also subjoin sundry invincible arguments proving our Lord Jesus Christ to be him that was promised. I shall add only some few of them, and that very briefly, because they have been by others in an especial manner at large insisted on.

First, then, He testified of himself that he was the Messiah, and that those who believed not that he was so should perish in their sins. Now because, according unto a general rule, he granted that although the testimony which he gave concerning himself, being the testimony of the Son of God, was true, yet it might be justly liable to exception amongst them, for the confirmation of his assertion he appeals to the works that he wrought, issuing the difference and question about his testimony in this, that if his works were not such as never any other man had wrought, or ever could work, but the Messiah only, they should be at liberty as to their believing in him. "The works," saith he, "that my Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father

hath sent me," John v. 36; that is, to be the Messiah. His own record he asserts to be true, appeals also to the testimony of John, but shows it withal to be inferior to those other witnesses which he had, namely, the Scripture and his own works. And so also, chap. x. 37, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not."

57. Many things might be insisted on for the confirmation of this argument. I shall only point at the heads of them; nor is there more necessary unto our present purpose.

First, All true, real miracles are effects of divine power. Many things prodigious, marvellous, or monstrous, beside the common and ordinary productions of nature, may be asserted and brought forth by an extraordinary *concurrence* of causes not usually falling in such a juncture and coincidence; many may be wrought by the great, hidden, and to us unknown power of *wicked spirits;* many things may have an appearance of prodigy and wonder, by the force of some *deceit*, pretence, or delusion, that attends the manner of their declaration. But *real miracles* are effects so above, beside, or contrary to, the nature and efficacy of any or all natural causes, that by no application or disposition of them, though never so uncouth or unusual, can they be produced; and therefore they must of necessity be the effects of an almighty *creating power*, causing somewhat to exist in matter or manner out of nothing, or out of that which is more adverse unto the being or manner of existence given unto it than nothing itself. Such are the works of raising the dead, opening the eyes of men born blind, etc. And this position the Jews will not deny, seeing they make it the foundation of their adherence unto the law of Moses.

58. Secondly, When God puts forth his *miracle-working power* in the confirmation of any word or doctrine, he avows it to be of and from himself, to be absolutely and infallibly true, setting the fullest and openest seal unto it which men, who cannot discern his essence or being, are capable of receiving or discerning. And therefore when any doctrine, which in itself is such as becometh the holiness and righteousness of God, is confirmed by the emanation of his divine power in the working of miracles, there can no greater assurance, even by God himself, be given of the truth of it.

59. Thirdly, The Lord Jesus, in the days of his flesh, wrought many great, real miracles, in the confirmation of the testimony that he gave concerning himself, that he was the Christ, the Son of God. So John v. 20, vii. 31, x. 25, xii. 37. Greater confirmation it could not have. Now, that the Lord Jesus wrought the miracles recorded by the evangelists, with others innumerable that are not recorded, John xx. 30, xxi. 25, we have in general all the testimony, evidence, and certainty, that any man can possibly have of things which he saw not done with his own eyes. And to suppose that a man can have no assurance of any thing but what he sees or feels himself, as

it overthrows all the foundations of knowledge in the world and of all human society, yea, of every thing that as men we either do or know; so, being once granted, it will necessarily follow that we know not the things that we see any longer than whilst we see them,—no, nor perhaps then either, seeing the evidence we have of knowing any thing by our senses proceeds from principles and presumptions which we never saw, nor can ever so do. And as for the Jews, we have all the advantage for the confirmation of what we affirm that either we are capable of or need to desire.

60. (1.) We plead *our own records*, that were written by the *evangelists*. And herein we have but one request to make unto the Jews,—namely, that they would lay no exceptions against them which they know to be of equal force against the writings of Moses and all the prophets. If they declare themselves to be such bedlamites as to set their own houses on fire, for no other end but to endanger those of their neighbours; if they will destroy the principles of their own faith and religion, to cast the broken pieces of them at the heads of Christians; if they cry, "Pereant amici dummodo et pereant inimici;"—they are not fit to be any longer contended withal. I desire, then, to know what one exception the Jews can lay against this record, which, "mutatis mutandis," may not be laid against the Mosaical writings. And if they have always concluded all such exceptions to be invalid as to an opposition unto those grounds and evidences on which they believe those writings, why will they not give us leave to affirm the same of them in reference unto those which we receive and believe on no less certain testimonies and evidences? Unless, then, they can except any thing to the credit of our writers, or disprove that which is written by them from records of equal weight with them,—which they can never do, nor do they attempt it,—they have nothing reasonable to plead in this cause. To tell us that they do not believe what is written by them, neither did their forefathers, is, as to themselves, no more than we know, and as to their forefathers, nothing but what those very writers testify concerning them; and to look for their consent unto that in any record, which that record witnesseth that they dissented from, is to overthrow the record itself and all that is contained in it. The Jews, then, have nothing to oppose unto this testimony but only their own unbelief,—which, for all the reasons that have been insisted on, cannot be admitted as any just exception; story or circumstance they have none to oppose unto it.

61. (2.) We plead the *notoriety of the miracles* wrought by Christ, and the *tradition* delivering them down unto us. This also the Jews plead concerning the miracles of Moses. They were, say they, openly wrought in the sight of all Israel; and that they were so wrought, the testimony of Israel in succeeding ages is, next

to the writing itself, the best and only witness they have of them. And wherein doth our testimony come short of theirs? Nay, on both accounts,—of their *first notoriety* and *succeeding tradition*,—it far exceeds what they have to plead; for as the miracles of Moses were wrought openly, so the most of them were so only in the sight of that one people, whom he had under his own conduct, in a wilderness, remote from any converse with other nations, and that in those *dark times* of the world wherein men were generally stupid and credulous, as having not been imposed on by the delusions which the following ages were awakened by. The Jews also lay no greater weight on any miracles than they do on those which were wrought in the wilderness of Midian, which had no witness unto them but that of Moses himself. But the miracles of Jesus were all, or most of them, wrought before the eyes of multitudes, envying, hating, and persecuting him; and that in the most knowing days of the world, when reason and learning had improved the light of the minds of men to the utmost of their capacity; and in and upon multitudes, for sundry years together; being all of them sifted by his adversaries, to try if they could discover any thing of deceit in them. And although his *personal ministry* was confined to one nation, yet the miracles wrought by his disciples, in his name and by his power, for the confirmation of his being the Messiah, were spread all the world over; so that all mankind were first filled with the report of them, and then satisfied with their truth, and lastly the generality of them with faith in him which they directed unto. The notoriety, therefore, of his miracles far exceedeth that of those of Moses. And for the means whereby the certainty of them is continued unto us, whether we respect the *number* of persons confirming it, or their *quality*, or their *disinterest* as to any carnal advantage, or their *suffering* for their testimony, it is notorious that the Jews' condition, confined merely to themselves, is no way to be compared with it. So that we may truly say, that no Jew can possibly, on any rational account, give credit unto the truth of the miracles wrought by Moses, and deny it unto them wrought by the Lord Jesus.

62. But yet there seems somewhat further necessary in this case. Though there were miracles wrought by our Saviour, yet they might be every way *inferior* unto them wrought by Moses, and so not sufficient to testify unto a doctrine and authority removing and abolishing the laws and customs instituted by Moses. And this the Jews of old seem to have had respect unto, in their endless tumultuary calling after signs and miracles. And hence, though the Lord Christ sometimes pleaded with them the works that he wrought, leaving them to stand or fall according unto the evidence of them, John x 37, xv. 24 (as also did the apostles afterwards, Acts ii. 22), unto the astonishment of all, and satisfaction of the less obdurate,

Mark vii. 37, John vii. 31;—yet both he himself constantly refused to gratify their curiosity and unbelief, when they required any sign or miracle of him, Matt. xii. 38, 39, xvi. 4, Luke xi. 29; and the apostle Paul expressly condemneth the whole principle in them, as that which, in the preaching of the gospel, was not to be gratified nor much attended unto, 1 Cor. i. 22. But yet neither is there any strength wanting unto our argument on this account also; for although it be not at all necessary that he who comes with an after-revelation of the will of God, reversing any thing before established, should be attested unto with *more miracles*, or those that are *more signal*, than he or they were who were the instruments of the first revelation of things to be repealed (seeing no more is required but that he be *sufficiently evidenced* to be sent of God, which may be done by one true, real miracle as well as by a thousand), yet the wisdom of God hath so ordered things, that the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus did on many accounts exceed those wrought by Moses, as by a comparison in some particular instances will appear.

63. First, the *number* of them gives them the pre-eminence. The Jews contend that there were seventy-six miracles wrought by Moses, whereas those of all other prophets, as they observe, amount but unto seventy-four; for so do they lay hold on every occasion to exalt him who yet judgeth and condemneth them. To make up this number they reckon up sundry things that happened about his birth and death,—far enough from miracles wrought by him or in the confirmation of his ministry. They add also every extraordinary work of God that fell out in his days to the same purpose. Be it so, then, that so many miracles were wrought by Moses, as we are far from diminishing any thing of the glory of his ministry, yet what are these compared unto those wrought by Christ, and his apostles in his name, and by his power and authority? Those that are recorded of his own are not easily reckoned up, and yet those that are *written* are far the least part of what he did perform, and that in the space of three or four years, whereas those of Moses were scattered over the whole course of his life for an hundred and twenty years. Thus John assures us that he did many more signs besides those that are written, chap. xx. 30, 31; and that his testimony is equal unto that of Moses we have proved before. He adds, that "the world could not contain the books" that might be written of his miracles, chap. xxi. 25; by which usual hyperbole a great multitude is designed.

Nor did the writers of the story of the gospel agree to give an account of all the miracles that were wrought by the author of it, but only to leave sufficient instances on record of his divine power in the effecting of them. For this end they singled out some works that were occasionally attended with some disputes or preachings,

tending unto the opening and confirmation of the doctrine of the gospel. Thus, upon the coming of the disciples of John unto him, it is said, Luke vii. 21, "In that same hour he cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind he gave sight." The particular stories of none of these are anywhere mentioned; nor had that season been at all remembered, but upon occasion of those persons who were sent unto him, the present works which they saw being made the ground of that answer which he returned unto their master, verse 22, "Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see," etc. Considering, therefore, what is elsewhere written, of all the regions about bringing in their sick, weak, and impotent, and of the cure of persons by the touching of his garment, it is evident that his personal miracles amounted unto thousands; which might well give occasion to the hyperbole used by John in recounting of them. Hence, some among the Jews were convinced that he was the Messiah, not only by the *greatness* but also by the *number* of his works: John vii. 31, "Many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man doeth?" And what are the seventy-six miracles of Moses unto those as to number, which in the first place the Jews glory in? And if we may add those which were wrought by his power by them that preached the gospel on his commission, as they are all of the same efficacy unto the end proposed, or confirmation of his being the Messiah, they amount not unto *thousands* only, but probably unto *millions;* for of this sort were all the *miraculous gifts* of the Holy Ghost that were granted unto the church all the world over. So that as to the *number of miracles*, he was sufficiently by them attested to be the Messiah, the great Lawgiver of the people of the new covenant.

64. Again, the Jews much insist on this, that all other prophets wrought miracles by the *intervention of prayer*, Moses alone without it, at his own pleasure. The *rod*, they say, was committed unto him as a *kingly sceptre*, to denote that authority whereunto the whole nature of things gave place. It is true, indeed, it is not recorded that *Moses prayed* in words before every miracle that was wrought by him or in reference unto his ministry; but yet this is plain in story, that he wrought no *mighty work* but either upon his prayer, or some express command and direction from God in particular; which everts the *Judaical pretence* of an abiding power remaining with him, enabling him to work miracles when and how he would. But this, which they falsely ascribe unto Moses, was eminently true of the Lord Jesus. Those thousands of miraculous works which he wrought were the arbitrary effects of a word of command, without any especial direction for every new work; arguing

the constant presence of an infinite power with him, exerted according to his will. "Come out of him," "Come out of the grave," "I will, be thou clean," "Be opened," and the like expressions, he used as signs and pledges thereof. Thus was it not with Moses, as the story manifests, yea, he himself greatly doubted of the greatest effect of the divine power put forth by him, when he smote the rock to bring forth water.

65. The *nature* of the miracles also wrought by the one and the other may be compared, and we shall see from thence on which side the pre-eminence will be found. For those wrought by Moses, or by God himself whilst he employed him in the service of giving the law and the delivery of the people, they were for the most part *portentous prodigies*, suited to fill men with wonder, astonishment, and fear Such were all the signs of the presence of God on Mount Sinai The effects also of most of them were *evil* and *destructive*, proceeding from wrath and indignation against sin and sinners. Such were all the mighty works wrought in Egypt, such those of the swallowing up of Dathan and Abiram in the wilderness. Those that tended unto the good and relief of mankind, as the bringing of water from the rock, were typical and occasional. And these kinds of works were suited unto that *ministry of death and condemnation* which was committed unto him. But, on the other side, the mighty works of the Lord Jesus were evidently effects of *goodness* as well as of *power*, and consisted in things useful and helpful unto mankind. Healing the sick, opening the eyes of the blind and the ears of the deaf, giving strength to the lame, casting out devils, feeding hungry multitudes, raising the dead, are things *amiable and useful*. And though *terrible prodigies* may more affect and astonish carnal minds, such as the Jews were filled with, yet works of *grace* and *goodness* do more allure those who attend unto the dictates of right reason. Evidences they were of a *gracious ministry*, tending unto salvation and peace in every kind, such as that of the Messiah was promised and foretold to be. As miracles, then, were the tokens of their several ministries, and bespake the nature of them, those of the Lord Christ were exceedingly more excellent than those of Moses.

66. Furthermore, as Moses had not a power of working miracles constantly resident with him, which he might exert according unto his own will, so he was very far from being able to communicate any such power unto others. God, indeed, took of the spirit that was on him and gave it unto the elders that were to be joined with him in the government of the people, Num. xi. 25; but yet neither was there a power of working miracles going along with that spirit, but only ability for rule and government, nor yet was that communication of it any act of Moses at all. But now our Lord Jesus, as

he had the divine power mentioned always with him, so he could give authority and power unto whom he pleased, to *effect all such miraculous works* as were any way necessary for the confirmation of their doctrine. Of this nature was the commission which he gave the twelve when he sent them forth, Matt. x. 8, "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils;" as also that unto the seventy, Luke x. 17–19. Yea, he promised them (which also came to pass), that, by his power and presence with them, they should do greater things than those which they had seen him do, John xiv. 12; Mark xvi. 17, 18. And this difference is so eminent that nothing can be objected against it. This more evidently confirmed him to be the Messiah than all the mighty works which he wrought in his own person on the earth.

67. Again, All the miracles of Moses *ended with his life* The Jews indeed, some of them, tell us a company of foolish stories about his death, which, as their manner is, they would fix on these words, Deut. xxxiv. 5, "And Moses died עַל־פִּי יְהוָה," "by the mouth" (or "word") "of the LORD;" as, namely, how he contended with מלאך המות, "the angel of death," and drove him away with his rod, so that he could not die until God laid his mouth unto his, and so took out his soul from him. But these figments are shameful, and such as become none but themselves. However, these things extended only unto his death; therewith ended his ministry and miracles. But now the greatest miracle of our Lord Jesus was wrought by him after the violent and cruel death which he underwent for our sakes; for he took his life again, and raised himself from the dead, John x. 17, 18. This being performed by him after the dissolution of his human nature, in the open, visible separation of his body and soul,—in which state it was utterly impossible that that nature should put forth any act toward the retrievement of its former condition,—manifested his existence in another superior nature, acting with power on the human in the same person. And this one miracle was a sufficient vindication of the truth which he had taught concerning himself,—namely, that he was the Messiah, the Son of God. And though any should question his being raised again from the dead by his own power, yet the evidence is uncontrollable that he was raised again by the power of God, without the application of the means and ministry of any other; whereby the holy and eternal God of truth entitled himself unto all that he had taught concerning his person and office whilst he was alive. And this leaves no room for hesitation in this matter; for this being granted, none will deny but that he was the Messiah; and what principles we proceed upon for the proof of it unto the Jews hath been before declared.

68. Unto what hath been summarily recounted, we may lastly

add the *continuance* of the miracles wrought by his power after his leaving of this world and his ascension into heaven. And there is in this an additional evidence unto what hath been insisted on: for whereas the miraculous works that were wrought by himself and his disciples, whilst he conversed with them in the flesh, were confined, as we observed before, unto the land of Canaan, those who afterwards received power from above, by his grant and donation, continued to assert the like mighty works and miracles all the world over; so that, within the space of a few years, there was scarce a famous town or city in the world wherein some of his disciples had not received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. And this also distinctly confirms him to be the promised Messiah; for whereas the isles of the Gentiles were to wait for and to receive his law, it was necessary that among them also it should receive this solemn kind of attestation from heaven.

69. Now, from what hath been spoken, it appears not only that the miracles wrought by Jesus were sufficient to confirm the testimony which he gave concerning himself,—namely, that he was the promised Messiah, the Son of God,—but also that they were so much more eminent than those wherewith God was pleased to confirm the ministry of Moses in the giving of the law, that the Jews have no reason to doubt or question his authority for the reversing of any institution of worship which they had formerly been obliged unto.

70. To close this argument, I shall only manifest that the Jews of old were convinced of the truth of the miracles wrought by the Lord Jesus; and therein a little discover the vanity of those pretences whereby they attempt to shield themselves from the natural consequence of that conviction.

First, For those who lived in his own days, see Matt. xii. 23; John vii. 31, ix. 16, xi. 47; Acts iv. 16, xix. 13. Neither did they at any time dispute his works, but only the power whereby they were wrought; of which afterwards.

Secondly, The fame and reputation of them was such amongst them, that those who made an art and trade of casting out of devils used the invocation of the name of Jesus over the possessed; which the notoriety of his exerting his divine power in that kind of work induced them unto. See Acts xix. 13. They adjured the spirits by the name of Jesus, whom Paul preached, observing the miracles that he wrought in that name: for they being ignorant of the true way and means whereby the apostle wrought his miraculous works, after the manner of magicians, they used the name of him whom he preached in their exorcisms; as it was ever the custom of that sort of men to intermix their charms with the names of such persons as they knew to have excelled in mighty works. And that this was

common among the Jews of those days is evident from Luke ix. 49; which could no otherwise arise but from a general consent in the acknowledgment of the works wrought by him.

Thirdly, We have also hereunto the suffrage of the *Talmudical rabbins* themselves,—the most malicious adversaries that ever the Lord Jesus had in this world. They intend not, indeed, to bear witness unto his miracles; but partly whilst they relate stories that were continued amongst them by tradition, partly whilst they endeavour to shield their unbelief from the arguments taken from them, they tacitly acknowledge that they were indeed wrought by him. This I say they do, whilst they labour to show by what ways and means those prodigies and wondrous works which are recorded of him were wrought and effected; for they who say this or that was the way whereby such a thing was accomplished, do plainly acknowledge the doing of the thing itself. Greater evidence of their self-conviction it is impossible they should give in, nor need we desire.

71. First, in the Talmud itself they have traditional stories of miracles wrought by the disciples of Jesus, and by others, in his name; which although they are, like the rest of their narrations, foolish and insipid, yet they evidence the tradition that was amongst them from the forementioned conviction. Thus in Aboda Zara they have a story concerning James, who lived longest amongst them. "It happened," they say, "that Eleazer the son of Dama was bitten by a serpent, and James of the village of Sechaniah" (that is, Bethany) "came to cure him, in the name of Jesus the son of Pandira; but R. Ishmael opposed him, and said, 'It is not lawful for thee, thou son of Dama:'" so owning that miracles and cures were wrought by James in the name of Jesus. And in Sabbat. Hierusal. Distinct. Schemona Scheratikin, they tell us that "the son of Rab. Jose, the son of Levi, had swallowed poison. A certain man came and communed with him in the name of Jesus the son of Pandira, and he was healed. But when he was gone out, one said unto him, 'How didst thou adjure him?' He said, 'By such a word.' The other replied, 'That it had been better for him to have died than to have heard that word.'" I mention these things only to show that they were never able to stifle the tradition that passed among themselves concerning the miracles wrought by Jesus and his disciples.

72. But this conviction more evidently discovers itself in their endeavours to assign his mighty works unto other causes, so that they may not from them be forced to acknowledge his divine power, and the presence of God with him. And there are two pretences which they make use of. The first is that of their forefathers, Matt. xii. 24. They would have the devil to be the author of them,

and that he wrought them by magical incantations. This they pleaded of old, and this some of them pretend to adhere unto to this day; the folly of which blasphemy both reflects upon themselves, and is demonstratively removable from him whom, to their eternal ruin, they seek to reproach. For,—

(1.) Do they not know that their own Moses was generally esteemed, by the wisest of the heathen, to have been skilled and exercised in magic. So Pliny and Apuleius testify; and that he wrought wonders by virtue thereof, Celsus contends at large. And can they fix on a readier course to confirm such a suspicion in the minds of *atheistical scoffers*, than by their own taking up the same accusation against the author of more and greater miracles than those wrought by Moses? What colour of answer can they return unto their reproaches, whilst themselves, with more open impudence, manage the same accusation against the Lord Jesus? Besides, as is confessed, Egypt was the spring of magical incantations, the world's academy for that diabolical cunning, where almost alone it was had in honour and reputation. There, in the king's court, had Moses his education and conversation forty years. How much more just, then (though sufficiently unjust), might a suspicion seem concerning him, of his being skilled in that falsely-called wisdom, than concerning our Lord Jesus, who was persecuted thither, and returned thence in his infancy, which they childishly object unto him! So that in this whole vain pretence they do nothing but attempt to cast down their own foundations.

(2.) Neither, indeed, do they account skill in and use of *magical incantations* a crime, but an excellency Josephus would have us believe that the art of magic and the invention of incantations was part of the wisdom of Solomon; and their Talmudical doctors do expressly approve of that diabolical art. Nothing, then, but extreme malice and desperation could put them upon inventing this cloak for their infidelity, which not only casts down the foundation of their own profession, but involves also a contradiction unto those principles which at other times they avouch. So that Rabbi Achor was mistaken when he gave out that as a prophecy, which was indeed a history, namely, that a generation of ungodly men among the Jews would not believe the things that the Messiah should do, but should affirm that he doth them by magical art.

73. For the blasphemy itself, there needs no other answer be given unto it but what was returned by our Lord Jesus of old. If those things had been done by magical incantations, and consequently by the assistance of the devil, it must needs be upon a division of those wicked spirits among themselves, and that upon the main design of their kingdom, dominion, and interest in this world. The open and proclaimed work of our Lord Jesus in this world, was by all

ways and means to overthrow the kingdom of Satan and his works. This he *privately* taught, this he *publicly* declared, to be the main end of his coming into this world. The works and miracles which he wrought were very many, innumerable of them exercised on devils themselves, to their shame, terror, and dispossession of the habitations they had invaded. In and during this work, he declares them to all the world to be evil, wicked, malicious, unclean, and lying spirits, reserved for everlasting destruction in hell, under the wrath of the great God. For this cause they, on the other side, ceased not to oppose him, and to stir up all the world against him, until they thought they had prevailed in his death. If men, therefore, shall imagine or fancy that the works of Christ against the interest of Satan, upon his person, unto his shame;—wrought to confirm a doctrine teaching all the world to avoid him, abhor him, fight and contend against him; commending every thing that he hates, with promise of life eternal unto them who forsake him and maintain his quarrel against him; threatening every thing that he loves and labours to promote in the world with eternal vengeance,—were wrought by his help and assistance, they had more need to be sent unto the place where the maladies of those distracted in their wits are attended, than to have an answer given unto their folly.

74. They have yet another pretence, to preserve themselves from the efficacy of this self-conviction. But this is so perfectly Judaical,—that is, so full of monstrous, ridiculous figments,—that nothing but an aim to discover their present desperate folly, and with what unmanly inventions they endeavour to cover themselves from the light of their own conviction, can give countenance unto the repetition of it. Besides, the fable itself is vulgarly known, and I shall therefore only give a brief compendium of it, seeing it may not be wholly avoided.

The story they tell us is this: There was a stone in the sanctum sanctorum, under the ark, wherein was written "Shem Hamphorash" (so the Cabbalists call the name Jehovah). He that could learn this name might, by the virtue of it, do what miracles he pleased. Wherefore the wise men, fearing what might ensue thereon, made two brazen dogs, and set them on two pillars before the door of the sanctuary. And it was so, that when any one went in and learned that name, as he came out those dogs barked so horribly that they frighted him, and made him forget the name that he had learned. But Jesus of Nazareth going in, wrote the name on parchment, and put it within the skin of his leg, and closed the skin upon it; so that though he lost the remembrance of it at his coming out, by the barking of the brazen dogs, yet he recovered the knowledge of it again out of the parchment in his leg: and by virtue thereof he wrought miracles,—walked on the sea, cured the lame, raised the dead, and opened the

eyes of the blind. That alone which from hence we aim to evince, is the conviction that the most stubborn of the Jews had of the miracles of our blessed Saviour. Had they not been openly performed, and undeniably attested, no creatures that ever had the shape of men, or any thing more of modesty than the brazen dogs they talk of, would have betaken themselves to such monstrous foolish figments for a countenance and pretence unto the rejection of him and them. He that should contend that the sun did not shine all the last year, and should give this reason of his assertion, because a certain man of his acquaintance climbed up to heaven by a ladder and put him in a box, and kept him close in his chamber all that while, would speak to the full with as much probability and appearance of truth as the grand rabbins do in this tale. Every word in their story is a monster. The stone, the writing of the name of God on it, the virtue of the pronunciation of that name, the brazen dogs, the entrance of a private man into the sanctum sanctorum, the barking of the dogs, are dreams becoming men under a penal infatuation and blindness, not much distant from those chains of darkness wherewith Satan himself is kept bound unto the judgment of the great day.

75. Fourthly, We must not forget the *testimony of his disciples*, who conversed with him, and were eye-witnesses of his miracles, especially of his rising from the dead. These, with multitudes ascertained of the truth by their testimony, to witness it unto the world willingly forewent all temporal interests, exposing themselves to dangers innumerable, and lastly sealed their testimony with their blood, shed by the most exquisite tortures that the malice of hell could invent; all in expectation of acceptance with him and a reward from him, which depended on the truth of the miracles which they asserted him to have wrought and performed. From all these considerations, we may safely conclude that it is utterly impossible that the nature of man should be more ascertained of any thing that ever was in this world, than we may be of the miracles wrought by our Lord Jesus. Now all these, as we have declared, were wrought by the divine power of God, to confirm the truth of his being the promised Messiah. And if this were not so, it is impossible that God should ever more require an assent unto any revelation of his mind or will, none being capable of a more evident and full confirmation so to be than this hath received of Jesus being the Christ. The application of this consideration in particular unto his resurrection from the dead hath been the special subject of so many writers, that I shall not further insist upon it.

76. One argument more, taken from the *success* that the doctrine of Jesus hath had in the world, shall close this discourse. What was his outward condition in this world we acknowledge, and the

Jews triumph in. The poverty of it, the contempt and reproach that it was exposed unto, was one of the chief pretences that they had, and have to this day, for their refusal of him. The time wherein he came was that, as hath been showed, wherein the Jews were in daily expectation of their Messiah, and when the residue of mankind were in the full enjoyment of all that light, wisdom, and knowledge, which the principles of nature could attain unto. In this state of things, a poor man, living in an obscure village of Galilee, not taught by men so much as to read, begins to preach and to declare himself to be the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. With this testimony he declares a doctrine destructive of the religion and sacred worship of all and every man then living in the world;—of the Jews as to the manner of it, which they esteemed above its substance; and of all others in its very nature and being;—and presseth a course of obedience unto God decried by them all. To encourage men to believe in him and to accept of his testimony, he gives them promises of what he would do for them when this life should be ended No sooner doth he undertake this work, but the Jews amongst whom he conversed, almost universally, at least all the great, wise, learned, and esteemedly devout amongst them, set themselves to scorn, despise, reproach, and persecute him. And this course they ceased not, until, conspiring with the power of the Gentiles, they took him out of the world as a malefactor, by a bitter, shameful, and ignominious death. After which he riseth again from the dead, and shows himself neither unto Jews nor Gentiles in common, but only to some poor men chosen by himself to be his witnesses and apostles. These begin to teach both Jews and Gentiles the things before mentioned. The Jews, more deeply engaged than formerly, by having slain their Master, immediately persecute them, and that unto death. The Gentiles at first deride and scorn them, but quickly change their note, and set all their wit and power at work to extirpate them and their followers out of the world. The Jews, on many accounts, looked upon themselves as ruined and undone for ever, if their testimony were admitted. The Gentiles saw that, on the same supposition, they must forego all their religion, and therewith every thing wherewith they pleased themselves in this world. Invisible infernal powers, who ruled in the world by superstition and idolatry, were no less engaged against them. With them was neither *human wisdom* or counsel, nor *external force;* yea, the use of both in their work was by their Master severely interdicted unto them. Had not the truth and power of God been engaged with them and for them, it is such a madness to suppose that this undertaking could have been carried on unto that issue and event, in the conquest of mankind, which it at length obtained, as no man not utterly forsaken of reason, or cursed with blindness of mind, or

made senseless and stupid by the power of his lusts, can make himself guilty of. Many are the branches of this argument, many the considerations that concur in a contribution of evidence and strength unto it; all which to examine and improve is beyond our present design The bare proposal of it is sufficient to cause all Jewish exceptions to vanish out of the minds of sober and reasonable men. From it, therefore, with them that went before, we conclude the third part of our general thesis concerning the Messiah,—namely, *That Jesus of Nazareth, whom Paul preached, was he.*

EXERCITATION XVIII.

JEWS' OBJECTIONS AGAINST CHRISTIAN RELIGION ANSWERED.

1. Objections of the Jews against the doctrine of Christianity. 2. Their general argument to prove the Messiah not yet come—General answer—Principles leading to a right understanding of the promises concerning the Messiah. 3. Redemption and salvation promised by him spiritually—Folly and self-contradiction of the Jews, that expect only temporal deliverance by him. 4. Promises of temporal things accessory and occasional; thence conditional—The general condition of them all suited to the nature and duration of the kingdom of the Messiah. 5. Spiritual things promised in words which first signify things temporal—Reasons thereof—Of peace with God, and in the world. 6. Seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel; Zion, Jerusalem; who and what intended thereby. 7. All nations, the world, the Gentiles, in the promise, who. 8, 9. Promises suited unto the duration of the kingdom of the Messiah. 10. The calling and flourishing state of the Jews thereon. 11. Particular promises may not be understood, or understood amiss, without prejudice to the faith. 12. Application of these principles. 13, 14. Promise of universal peace in the days of the Messiah, Isa. ii. 2–4, considered. 15. Jewish objections from it answered—Outward peace, how intended. 16. Promises of the diffusion of the knowledge of God, and of unity in his worship, Jer. xxxi. 34, Zeph. iii. 9, Zech. xiv. 9. 17–19. Jewish exceptions answered. 20. Promises concerning the restoration and glorious estate of Israel; 21. Fulfilled to the spiritual Israel; to the Jews in the appointed season—Their calling, and peace ensuing thereon.

1. THAT which remaineth, for a close unto these dissertations, is the consideration of those *reasons and arguments* wherewith the *present Jews* do endeavour, and their forefathers for many generations have laboured, to defend their obstinacy and unbelief; and this we shall engage into with as much briefness as the nature of the matter treated of will admit. Many are the books which they have written among themselves, mostly in the Hebrew tongue, and some in other languages, but the Hebrew character, against Christians and their religion. Unto sundry of these they give triumphant, insulting titles, as though they had undoubtedly obtained a perfect victory

over their adversaries; but the books themselves in nothing answer their specious frontispieces. Take away wilful mistakes, gross paralogisms, false stories, and some few grammatical niceties, and they vanish into nothing. What is spoken by them or for them that seems to have any weight shall be produced and examined.

Sundry things they object unto the doctrine of the gospel concerning the person of the Messiah, or his being God and man, and the rejection of the Mosaical ceremonies and law, which they deem eternal; and many exceptions they lay against particular passages and expressions in the historical books of the New Testament. But all these things have been long since cleared and answered by others; and I have also myself spoken to the most important of them, partly in the preceding discourses, partly in my defence of the deity and satisfaction of Christ against the Socinians. For what concerns the law of Moses, and the abolition of it, as to the ceremonial worship therein instituted, it must be at large insisted on in that Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews which these discourses are only intended to make way unto. I shall not here, therefore, enter upon a particular discussion of their opinions, arguments, and objections about these things; besides, they belong not immediately to the subject of our present discourse. It is about the *coming of the Messiah* simply that we are disputing. This we assert to be long since past. The Jews deny him to be yet come, living in the hope and expectation of him; which at present is in them but as the giving up of the ghost. The means whereby this dying, deceiving hope is supported in them comes now under examination; and this alone is the subject of our ensuing discourse.

2. To countenance themselves, then, in their denial of the coming of the Messiah, they do all of them make use of one general argument, which they seek to confirm in and by several instances. Now, this is, that the *promises* made and recorded as to be accomplished at the coming of the Messiah are not fulfilled, and therefore the Messiah is not yet come. This fills up their books of controversies, and is constantly made use of by their expositors, so often as any occasion seems to offer itself unto them. The Messiah, say they, was promised of old. Together with him, and to be wrought by him, many other things were promised. These things they see not at all fulfilled, nay, not [even] those which contain the only work and business that he was promised for; and therefore they will not believe that he is come. This general argument, I say, they seek to confirm by instances; wherein they reckon up all the promises which they suppose as yet unaccomplished, and so endeavour to establish their conclusion. These we shall afterwards cast under the several heads whereunto they do belong, and return that answer which the word of truth itself and the event do manifest to be the mind of

God in them. For the present, unto their general argument, we say that *all the promises* concerning the coming of the Messiah are actually fulfilled; and those which concern his grace and kingdom are partly already accomplished, and for the remainder shall be so, in the manner, time, and season appointed for them and designed unto them in the purpose and counsel of God: so that from hence nothing can be concluded in favour of the Jews' incredulity. To evidence the truth of this answer, I shall lay down and confirm certain unquestionable principles, that will guide us in the interpretation of the promises that are under consideration.

3 The first is, *That the promises concerning the Messiah do principally respect spiritual things, and that eternal salvation which he was to obtain for his church.* This we have proved at large before; and this the very nature of the thing itself and the words of the promises do abundantly manifest. The Jews, I suppose, will not deny but the promise concerning the Messiah is of the greatest good that ever God engaged himself to bestow upon them. I do not find that they anywhere deny it; and it is at present the sum of all their desires, prayers, and expectations, with the hope whereof they comfort and support themselves in all their calamities. If they should deny it, it may easily be proved against them by innumerable testimonies of Scripture, many whereof have been already produced. Now there can be no reason of this, but only because he was to work and effect for them, whoever they be, unto whom he was promised, the greatest good that they may or can be made partakers of. But if it be only a good of an inferior nature that he was to effect, and any other means was to be used for that which was more principal and excellent, that means is much to be preferred before him and above him. Now, what is *this chief good of man?* Doth it consist in riches, honour, power, pleasures? The blindest of the heathen were never blind enough to think so; nor can any man entertain any such imagination without renouncing not only all right reason, but in an especial manner the whole Scripture. I think the Jews will not deny but that this good consists in the *favour of God* in this world, and the *eternal enjoyment of him* hereafter. Now, if the Messiah were promised only to procure those first, outward, temporary, perishing things, and these latter are to be obtained by another means,—namely, by the observation of the law of Moses,—it is evident that that is to be preferred infinitely before him; which that it is not, as we said, is manifest from the whole Scripture, and confirmed by the traditional hope and expectation of the Jews. For if they enjoy that which is incomparably the *chiefest good*, to what end do they so miserably bemoan themselves in their present condition, and with so much impatience cry out for the coming of their Messiah? Are they such slaves in their affections unto earthly,

perishing things, that, living in the enjoyment of all that is needful to procure them the love and favour of God, with the eternal enjoyment of him, they can have no rest or quiet because they enjoy not the good things of this life? Doubtless, this great expectation had a greater rise and cause than now they will own. I know men are apt to complain under, and to desire relief from, outward trouble; but to place the main of their religion herein, when they have grace, the pardon of sin, and heaven, on other accounts, this is only done by the Jews. But the truth is, although they continue in their desires of the coming of the Messiah, yet they have lost the reason why they do so: only this they find, that their forefathers from the days of Abraham placed all their happiness in his coming; and therefore they think that they also ought to do so, though *why*, they cannot tell, and will not understand. But this is that which we have proved to be the object of their faith and expectation of old,—namely, that the Messiah was promised to be a *spiritual Redeemer*, to save them from sin, Satan, death, and hell, to procure for them the favour of God, and to bring them to the enjoyment of him. Set this aside, and what have we to do to contend with the Jews about one that shall come and make war for them, conquer their enemies, and make them rich? Much good may it do them with such an one, when he comes. They say, indeed, that having the affluence of all things under him, they shall be the better enabled to keep the law of Moses, and so the way to heaven will be easier for them. But I fear that which they manifest their hearts to be set upon, as their chiefest end and aim, will scarcely much further them unto any other end whatever: the *last end* will not be made the means to another. Nor was it otherwise with their forefathers. "Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked." "According to their pasture were they filled;" and so they forgot the Lord. Prosperity ruined them; nor did they ever reform but under sore afflictions. The Messiah, then, that we contend with them about is a spiritual Redeemer. Such an one he was promised to be, as we have abundantly proved; and all promises of that nature are perfectly accomplished. He is come, and hath "saved his people from their sins." He hath "made an end of sin, and made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness." There is not one promise concerning grace, mercy, pardon, the love of God, and eternal blessedness by the Messiah,—which contain the whole of his direct and principal work,—but they are all yea and amen in Christ Jesus, are all exactly made good and accomplished. And this is testified unto by *millions of souls* now in the unchangeable fruition of God, and by all that seriously believe in him, who are yet alive. And this is firstly to be considered in our inquiry after the accomplishment of the promises concerning the coming, grace, and kingdom of the Messiah.

4. Secondly, Hence it follows, *That all promises concerning tem-*

poral things, at his coming or by it, are but accessory and occasional, and such as appertain not directly to his principal work and main design of his coming. Certain it is, that the whole work for which God of old promised the Messiah might have been effected and fully accomplished, though not one word had been spoken of any outward advantage to ensue thereon in this world. These promises, then, belong not *directly* and *immediately* to the covenant of the Redeemer, but are declarations only of the sovereign will and wisdom of God, as to what he would do, in the dispensation of his providence, at such and such a season. Hence two things will ensue:—

(1.) That all these promises may be *conditional.* Those which concerned the sending of the Messiah for the accomplishment of his principal work were *absolute,* and depended not upon any thing in any or all of the sons of men. The whole of it was a mere effect of sovereign grace. He was, therefore, infallibly to come at his appointed season. But those that concern the dispensation of God's *providence in temporal things* may all of them be *conditional.* And evident it is that they have one condition annexed to the fulfilling of every one of them; and that is, that those who would partake of them do submit themselves unto the law and rule of the Messiah: for in the midst of the greatest collection of promises in the whole Old Testament, which at first view seem to express the glory of the kingdom of the Messiah in outward things, it is added, "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted," Isa. lx. 12. So that all the happiness intimated depends on the condition of men's submitting themselves to the law of the Messiah, without which they are threatened with desolation and utter wasting. This condition belongs unto them all; and what other particular considerations there may be, on which their accomplishment may be suspended, we know not.

(2.) It follows also from hence, that *as to the times, seasons, and places of their accomplishment,* they are left unto the designation of God's sovereign will, wisdom, and pleasure, as are those of all other works of his providence whatever. It is not necessary that they should all of them be accomplished at the same time, or in the same place, or after the same manner. God may, and God doth, fulfil them when, where, how, and towards whom he pleaseth; so that in the issue they shall all have that accomplishment which he hath designed unto them, and which the church hath ground to expect. And thus hath God provided that they should be a ground of comfort and direction to the church in all ages, containing encouragements unto obedience, and consolations in what his saints may expect to fall upon their persecuting adversaries. The Jews, indeed, who know not even how to fancy the kingdom of their Messiah to

be any other but what the Roman commonwealth of men only was like to prove, "res unius ætatis," the business of one age, would have all these temporal promises to be fulfilled all at once, "momento turbinis," all on a sudden. But the *real kingdom of Christ* being to continue through many generations, even from his first coming unto the end of the world, and that in such a variety of states and conditions as God saw conducing unto his own glory, and the exercise of the faith and obedience of his people, the accomplishment of these promises in several ages, and at several seasons, according to the counsel of the will of God, is exceedingly suited unto the nature, glory, and exaltation of it. And this one observation may be easily improved to the frustrating all the objections of the Jews, from the *pretended non-accomplishment* of these promises.

5. Thirdly, *Whereas spiritual things have the principal place and consideration in the work and kingdom of the Messiah, they are oftentimes promised in words whose first signification denotes things temporal and corporeal.* And this came to pass and was so ordered on several accounts; for, (1.) The very way and manner of the prophets' expression of their visions and revelations,—wherein, after the way of the people of the east, they made use of many metaphors and allegories,—led them so to set forth spiritual things. That this was the custom of the prophets, as they expressly own it, and as is manifest in their writings, so it is confessed by the Jews, who, in their expositions of them, do ever and anon grant that this and that is to be interpreted בדרך משל, that is allegorically. Now, when it is granted that the subject-matter treated on is principally spiritual, all these metaphors are plain and easily accommodated unto the principal scope and end intended.

(2.) Again; as this was the manner of the prophets, so it is a way exceedingly instructive, and suited to convey an apprehension and sense of the things treated on unto the minds and understandings of men. All men know the *worth and usefulness* of the *precious things of the creation*,—gold, silver, precious stones; of the *desirable things of natural life*,—health, strength, long life; of the *good things of men in civil conversation*,—wealth, riches, liberty, rule, dominion, and the like. Men know somewhat of the worth of these things, and commonly esteem them above it. Now, what is more likely to affect their minds with, and raise their affections unto, *spiritual things*, than to have them proposed unto them under the names of those things whose excellency they are so well acquainted withal, and whose enjoyment they so much desire? For nothing can be more evident unto them, than that God, in these condescensions unto their capacities, doth declare that the things which he promiseth are indeed the most excellent and desirable that they can be made partakers of.

(3.) The state and condition of the church of old required such a way of instruction; for as they had then, in the covenant of the land of Canaan, many promises of earthly and carnal things, so they themselves were carnal, and received great encouragement to abide in their expectation of the coming of the Messiah from that outward glory which they apprehended that it would be attended withal. Besides, the time was not yet come wherein the veil was to be removed, and believers were with open face to behold the glory of God. And therefore, although this way of instruction, by similitudes, metaphors, and allegories, was suited, as we observed, in general to affect their minds and to stir up their affections, yet it did not give them that clear, distinct apprehension of the things of the kingdom of the Messiah which was afterwards revealed. God had other work to do among them, by them, and upon them, than openly and plainly to reveal his whole counsel in these things unto them. Hence the prophets themselves, who received the promises and revelations treated of from God, were fain to inquire with all diligence into the nature of the office, work, sufferings, and glory, of the Messiah, which they prophesied unto the church about, 1 Pet. i. 10–12; and yet all their inquiries came short of the understanding of those mysteries which he had who only saw the Messiah come in the flesh, and died before he had accomplished his work. But in all these promises there was provision laid in to compel, as it were, the most carnal mind to look principally after spiritual things, and to own an allegory in the expressions of them; for many of them are such, or otherwise have no tolerable signification or sense, nor ever shall have accomplishment unto eternity. Can any man be so stupidly sottish as to think that in the days of the Messiah, hills shall leap, and trees clap their hands, and waste places sing, and sheep of Kedar and rams of Nebaioth be made ministers, and Jews suck milk from the breasts of kings, and little children play with cockatrices, literally and properly? And yet these things, with innumerable of the like kind, are promised. Do they not openly proclaim to every understanding that all these expressions of them are metaphorical, and that some other thing is to be sought for in them? Some of the Jews, I confess, would fain have them all literally fulfilled unto a tittle. They would have a trumpet to be blown that all the world should hear, mountains to be levelled, seas to be dried up, wildernesses to be filled with springs and roses, the Gentiles carrying the Jews upon their shoulders, and giving them all their gold and silver! But the folly of these imaginations is unspeakable, and the blindness of their authors deplorable: neither, to gratify them, must we expose the word of God to the contempt and scorn of atheistical scoffers; which such expositions and applications of it would undoubtedly do. Now, this rule which we insist upon is especially to be heeded where spiritual and tem-

poral things, though far distant in their natures, yet do usually come under the same appellation. Thus is it with the peace that is promised in the days of the Messiah. Peace is either spiritual and eternal, with God; or outward and external, with men in this world. Now these things are not only distinct, and such as may be distinguished one from the other, but such as whose especial nature is absolutely different; yet are they both *peace*, and so called. The former is that which was chiefly intended in the coming of the Messiah; but this, being peace also, is often promised in those words which in their first signification denote the latter, or outward peace in this world amongst men. And this is frequent in the prophets.

6. Fourthly, *By "the seed of Abraham," by "Jacob" and "Israel," in many places of the prophets, not the carnal seed, at least not all the carnal seed, of them is intended, but the children of the faith of Abraham, who are the inheritors of the promise.* Here, I acknowledge, the Jews universally differ from us. They would have none but themselves intended in these expressions; and whatever is spoken concerning the seed of Abraham, if it be not accomplished in themselves, they suppose it hath no effect on any other in the world. And from this apprehension an objection was raised of old against the doctrine of our apostle; for on supposition that Jesus was the Messiah, and that the blessing was to be obtained by faith in him, whereas it was evident that far the greatest part of the Jews believed not in him, it would seem to follow that the promise God made to Abraham was of none effect, Rom. ix. 1, etc. But the apostle answers, that the promise did never belong unto all the carnal seed of Abraham: for whereas he had *many sons*, one of whom, Ishmael, was his first-born, yet *Isaac only* inherited the promise; and whereas Isaac himself had *two sons*, yet only *one of them*, and he the *younger*, enjoyed the privilege; and all this proceeded from the especial purpose of God, who takes into that privilege whom he pleaseth. So was his dealing with the Jews at that time. He called whom he pleased to a participation of the promise, and passed by whom he would; whereby it came to pass at last that all the elect obtained, and the rest were hardened. Now, the seed to whom the promise is given, are those only that obtain it by faith, being chosen thereunto; the residue being not intended in that appellation of "Israel," "Jacob," the "sons" and "seed of Abraham." Moreover, as those only of the *carnal seed of Abraham* who embrace the promise are received in this matter to be his seed, so all that follow the faith of Abraham, and believe unto righteousness, as he did, are his sons and the seed of the promise, although carnally they are not his offspring. The same also is to be said concerning those names of "Zion" and "Jerusalem," of both which such glorious things are spoken. I suppose none can imagine that it is the little hill so called, or the

streets and buildings of the town, that God did so regard. But one of them having been for a season, in the days of David, the special place of his worship, and the other the principal habitation of church and people, God expresseth his love and good-will to his church and worship under those names. And it is a fond thing to suppose that the respect mentioned should be unto those places themselves, which now for a thousand years have lain waste and desolate. Those promises, then, which we find recorded concerning Zion, Jerusalem, the seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel, do respect the elect of God, called unto the faith of Abraham, and worshipping God according unto his appointment, be they of what people or nation soever under heaven. And this we have proved before, in our dissertation about the oneness of the church of the Old and New Testament.

7. Fifthly, *By "all people," "all nations," "the Gentiles," "all the Gentiles," not all absolutely, especially at any one time or season, are to be understood, but either the most eminent and most famous of them, or those in whom the church, by reason of their vicinity, is more especially concerned.* God oftentimes charged the Jews of old that they had worshipped the gods of "all the nations;" whereby yet not all nations absolutely, but only those that were about them, with whom they had commerce and communication, were intended. These expressions, then, "all nations," and "all kingdoms," which are said to come into the church, and submit themselves unto the kingdom of the Messiah, at his coming, do not denote all *absolutely* in the world, especially at any one time or season, but only such as are either most eminent among them, or such as God would cause his light and truth to approach unto. And those which, in an especial manner, seem to be designed in these prophetical expressions, are that collection of nations whereof the Roman empire was constituted, which obtained the common appellation of "the whole world;" being for the main of them the posterity of Japheth, who were to be persuaded to dwell in the tents of Shem. The Jews would have all nations absolutely to be intended; and Kimchi, with Aben Ezra, tells us, on Isa. ii. 4, in these words of the prophet, "He shall judge among the nations," "That all nations of the earth shall live at peace; for whatever controversies they have among themselves, they shall come and refer the determination of them to the Messiah, living at Jerusalem." But how this should be done by all the nations of the earth absolutely, they are not pleased to declare unto us. Certainly the heat of some of their differences will be much abated before they have made a full end of their journey.

8. Sixthly, It must be observed, *That whatever is to be done and effected by the Spirit, grace, or power of the Messiah, during the continuance of his kingdom in this world, it is mentioned in the promises as that which was to be accomplished at or by his coming.*

But here, as we before observed, lieth the mistake of the Jews: whatever is spoken about his work and kingdom, they expect to have fulfilled as it were in a day; which neither the nature of the things themselves will bear, nor is it any way suited unto the glory of God or the duration of his kingdom in the world. The kingdom of the Messiah is prophesied of to be set up in the room of the other great kingdoms and monarchies that are in the world. And if we take an instance in the last monarchy of Daniel, namely, the Roman, it is spoken of as that which came forth as it were all at once into the world, and did all its work immediately; while we know that, from its first rise to the end of the things there spoken of, there passed above the space of a thousand years. But yet all the things ascribed unto it are mentioned as attending its rise and coming; and that because they were, in process of time, effected by its power. And, in like manner, all the things that are foretold about the kingdom of the Messiah are referred unto his coming; because before that they were not wrought, and they are produced by his Spirit and grace, the foundation of them all being perfectly and unchangeably laid in what he did and effected upon his first coming and appearance. It is no wonder, then, that many particular promises seem as yet to be unfulfilled; for they were never designed to be accomplished in a day, a year, an age, one place or season, but in a long tract of time, during the continuance of his kingdom,—that is, from his coming unto the end of the world. And as the *care* of the accomplishment of those promises is upon, so the *ordering* of the time and season of their being effected belongs unto, the counsel and will of the Father: who, as unto his children and servants, hath engaged unto him that he should see of the travail of his soul in all generations; and as unto his adversaries hath said, "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."

9. Again, *There are two ways whereby promises may be said to be accomplished by him who gives them.* (1.) The one is, when all is done, in respect of *outward means, helps, and advantages*, that is needful for that end, and which if men do not embrace and make use of, they are left inexcusable, and have none to blame for their coming short of enjoying the full benefit of the promises but themselves alone. And in this sense all the promises contended about are long since accomplished towards all the world. There is plentiful provision made in the doings and doctrines of the Messiah, as to outward means, for the peace of all the nations in the world, for the ruin of all false worship, for the uniting of Jews and Gentiles in one body in peace and unity; and that these things are not actually effected, the whole defect lies in the blindness, unbelief, and obstinacy of the sons of men, who had rather perish in their sins than be saved through obedience to this Captain of salvation. (2.) *God*

doth sometimes accomplish his promises by putting forth the efficacious power of his Spirit and grace, effectually and actually to fulfil them, by working the things promised in and upon them unto whom they are promised. And thus are all the promises of God that concern the Messiah, his work, his mediation, with the effects of them, his grace and Spirit, at all times, in all ages, absolutely fulfilled in and towards the elect, that seed of Abraham unto whom all the promises do in an especial manner belong. The election obtaineth the promise, although the rest are hardened. Now, if the Jews, or any other nation under heaven, shall at any time, or for a long season, continue to reject the terms of reconciliation with God and of inheriting the promises which are proposed unto them, "shall their unbelief make the truth of God of none effect? God forbid." The truth of God failed not when he brought only Caleb and Joshua into Canaan, the whole body of the people being consumed in the wilderness, by reason of their unbelief. God hath done, doth, and always will effectually fulfil all his promises to his elect; and for the residue of men, they come not short of the enjoyment of them, but upon their own sin, blindness, and unbelief.

10. Moreover, it is granted that there shall be a time and season, during the continuance of the kingdom of the Messiah in this world, wherein the generality of the nation of the Jews, all the world over, shall be called and effectually brought unto the knowledge of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ; with which mercy they shall also receive deliverance from their captivity, restoration unto their own land, with a blessed, flourishing, and happy condition therein. I shall not here engage into a confirmation of this concession or assertion. The work would be long and great, because of the difference about the time, season, and manner of their call, and their following state and condition; and so is unmeet for us to undertake in the winding up of these discourses. It is only the thing itself that I assert; nor have I any cause, as to the end aimed at, to inquire into the time and manner of its accomplishment. Besides, the event can be the only sure and infallible expositor of these things; nor, in matters of such importance as those before us, shall I trouble the reader with conjectures. The thing itself is acknowledged, as far as I can understand, by all the world that have any acquaintance with these things. Christians generally do assert it, look for it, pray for it; and have done so in all ages from the days of the apostles. Mohammedans are not without some thoughts of what shall befall the Jews before the end of the world. As to the Jews themselves, in their false notion of it, it is the life of their hopes and religion. What is it, then, that the Jews plead? what do they expect? what promises are given unto them? They say that they shall be delivered out of their captivity, restored to their own land, enjoy peace and quiet-

ness, glory and honour therein. We say the same concerning them also. But by whom shall these things be wrought for them? By their Messiah, they say, at his coming. But shall he do all these things for them whether they believe in him or no, whether they obey him or reject him, love him or curse him? Is there no more required unto this delivery but that he should come to them? Is it not also required that they should come to him? Here, then, lies the only difference between us. We acknowledge that the promises mentioned are not yet all of them actually fulfilled towards them; this they also plead. The reason hereof, they say, is because the Messiah is not yet come; so casting the blame on God, who hath not made good his word, according to the time limited expressly by himself. We say, the reason of it is because they come not by faith and obedience unto the Messiah, who long since came unto them; and so cast the blame where sure it is more likely to lie, even on them and their unbelief. They are in expectation that the Messiah will come to them; we, that they will come unto the Messiah: and it may be this difference may ere long be reconciled, by his appearance unto them, so calling them unto faith and obedience.

11. Lastly, *Suppose there should be any particular promise or promises, relating unto the times and kingdom of the Messiah, either accomplished or not yet accomplished, the full, clear, and perfect sense and intendment whereof we are not able to arrive unto, shall we therefore reject that faith and persuasion which is built on so many clear, certain, undoubted testimonies of the Scripture itself, and manifest in the event, as if it were written with the beams of the sun?* As such a proceeding could arise from nothing but a foolish, conceited pride, that we are able to find out God unto perfection, and to discover all the depths of wisdom that are in his word; so it would, being applied unto other things and affairs, overthrow all assurance and certainty in the world, even that which is necessary to a man to enable him to act with any satisfaction unto himself or others. What, then, we understand of the mind of God we faithfully adhere unto; and what we cannot comprehend, we humbly leave the knowledge and revelation of unto his divine majesty.

12. On these and the like principles,—which, most of them, are clear in the Scripture itself, and the rest deduced immediately from the same fountain of truth,—it is no hard matter to answer and remove those particular instances which the Jews produce to make good their general argument, whereby they would prove the Messiah not yet to be come, from the non-accomplishment of the promises that relate unto his coming and kingdom. It were a work endless and useless, to undertake the consideration of every particular promise which they wrest unto their purpose. They are not the words themselves, but the things promised, that are in controversy. Now

these, though expressed in great variety, and on occasions innumerable, yet may be referred unto certain general heads, whereunto they do all belong; and, indeed, unto these heads they are usually gathered by the Jews themselves in all their disputes against Christians. These, then, we shall consider, and show their consistency with that truth which we have abundantly evinced from the scriptures of the Old Testament, the common acknowledged principle between us.

13. First, then, They insist upon that *universal peace* in the whole world which they take to be promised in the days of the Messiah. To this purpose they urge the prophecy recorded Isa. ii. 2–4: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." This prophecy is in the same words repeated, Mic. iv. 1–4, where there is added unto the close of it, "But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid." And the like things are spoken of in sundry other places of that prophecy.

14 In this we agree with the Jews, that this is a prophecy of the time of the Messiah, of his kingdom in this world, and do willingly subscribe to that rule of Kimchi on the place, on these words, "In the last" (or "latter") "days:" כל מקום שנאמר באחרית הימים הוא ימות המשיח; —"In every place where there is mention of the last days, the days of the Messiah are intended:" which we have formerly made use of. We also consent unto him, that the המורה, "the teacher," that shall from Jerusalem instruct us in the law and will of the Lord, is מלך המשיח, "Messiah the king;" which manifests him to be a prophet no less than a king. And he also is the judge that shall "judge among the nations." Only, we differ from them in the exposition of "The mountain of the house of the LORD;"—which they take to be Mount Moriah; we, the worship of God itself. And whereas both of us are necessitated to depart from the letter, and allow a metaphor in the words,—for they will not contend that the hill Moriah shall be plucked up by the roots, and taken and set on the tops of other mountains they know not where, nor can they tell unto what purpose any such thing should be;—so our interpretation of the words,

which admits only of the most usual figurative expression, the place being taken for the worship performed in it, on the account whereof alone it was ever of any esteem, is far more easy and natural than any thing they can wrest the remainder of the words unto, supposing Mount Moriah to be literally understood. And in this sense we affirm the first part of the prophecy to be long since really, and to the full, accomplished. For whereas the *worship of God* before the coming of Christ was confined unto the temple at Jerusalem, attended unto by one poor, small, enslaved nation, and that in such outward contempt and scorn that it was no way to be compared with the glory of the *false worship* of the nations, and the compliance of multitudes of people unto it, the *mountains* being far more *visible, conspicuous,* and *stately,* than that at Jerusalem;—upon his coming and giving out the law of God unto the nations of the world, the most, the greatest, and the most glorious of them, consented unto the acceptance of it, and with one consent gave themselves up to the worship of the God of Jacob; whereby the worship of the true God was not only exalted and made more conspicuous than the lofty hills and "high places" of the world, wherein they worshipped their idols, but the most eminent mountains of the whole earth, as that of Diana at Ephesus, and of the Capitol at Rome, were destroyed and deserted, and the glory of the worship of God was lifted up above them. So that what the Jews think to plead for themselves doth indeed, in a manifest and open event, wholly evert their unbelief. But avoiding the consideration hereof, that which they principally insist upon is the peace promised under the kingdom of the Messiah; which, as it seems to them, is not accomplished. Yea, saith one of them, "Men are so far from beating their swords into plough-shares, that within a few hundreds of years, new instruments of war, never heard of in the world before, have been invented among them who pretend to believe in the Messiah." And this, as they think, makes it appear that really he is not as yet come into the world; the vanity of which pretence may easily be discovered from our former rules, which we shall briefly make application of unto its removal.

15. For, (1.) The temporal, outward peace of the world, if any such thing be here intended, is not the *principal part,* matter, or subject of the promise, but only *an accessory* unto it. The chief part of it, which concerns the *spiritual worship of God,* is evidently and openly fulfilled. That which is *temporal,* for the times and seasons of it, is left unto the sovereign will and wisdom of God for its accomplishment. Neither is it necessary that it should be fulfilled amongst *all nations at once,* but only amongst them who at any time or in any place effectually receive the laws of God from the Messiah. Whatever, then, of outward peace is really intended in this pro-

mise, as it hath in part already received its accomplishment, as we shall show, so the whole shall be fulfilled in the time and way of God's appointment. (2.) That the words are not to be understood *absolutely*, according to the strict exigence of the letter, is evident from that complement of the prediction in that of Micah, "Every one shall sit under his own vine and fig-tree," there being many, not only persons but great nations in the world, that have neither the one nor the other. (3.) The Jews themselves do not expect *such peace* upon the coming of their Messiah. War great and terrible with Gog and Magog they look for, which also the Scripture mentions; and that with Armillus is their own faith or fancy: only, it may be, they would have nobody to wage war with but themselves. For whereas they tell us that all nations shall come with their controversies to be ended by the Messiah at Jerusalem, and by that means prevent war among them, I suppose they will not do so until they are subdued, and those nations broken in pieces which will not serve them; which, whatever expedition they fancy to themselves, may take up at least half the reign of their Messiah, if he should live an hundred years, about which they differ; yea, plainly and openly great wars and desolations of the enemies of the children of God are foretold under the Messiah, Isa. lxiii. 1–6, etc. (4.) I shall not much insist on that *universal peace* which God gave unto all the known nations of the world at the coming of Christ in the reign of Augustus, though it looks more like an accomplishment of this prophecy than what the Jews imagine therein; but because it was only *coincident* with, by the providence of God, and not an effect of, his coming, I shall pass it by only as a diagnostic of the season wherein the Prince of Peace was to be born, and was so accordingly. But I say, (5.) That Christ at his coming wrought *perfect peace* between God and man, slaying the enmity and difference which, by reason of sin, was between them. This alone absolutely and properly is *peace;* without this all other outward quiet and prosperity is ruinous and destructive. And where this is, no wars or tumults can hinder but that the persons enjoying it shall be preserved in *perfect peace;* and this, if the Jews did believe, they would have experience of. (6.) He hath also wrought true *spiritual peace* and love between all that sincerely believe in him, all his elect; which although it frees them not from outward troubles, persecutions, oppressions, and afflictions in the earth, and that from some also that may make profession of his name (for Judah may be in the siege against Jerusalem, Zech. xii. 2), yet having peace with God and among themselves, they enjoy the promise unto the full satisfaction of their souls. And this *peace of the elect with God and among themselves* is that which singly and principally is intended in this prediction, though set out under terms and expressions of the things wherein

outward peace in this world doth consist. (7.) The Lord Christ, by his doctrine, hath not only proclaimed and offered peace with God unto all nations, but also given precepts of peace and self-denial, directing and guiding all the sons of men, were they attended unto and received, to live in peace among themselves, whereas the Jews of old had express command for war, and destroying of the nations among whom they were to inhabit; which gives a great foundation unto the promises of peace in the days of the Messiah. (8.) Let it be supposed that it is general outward peace, prosperity, and tranquillity, that are here promised unto the world, yet then,—[1.] The precise time of its accomplishment is not here limited or determined. If it be effected during the kingdom and reign of the Messiah in the world, the word is established and the prophecy verified. [2.] Our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles have foretold, that after his law and doctrine should be received in the world, there should a great defection and apostasy from the power and purity of it ensue, which should be attended with great persecutions, troubles, afflictions, wars, and tumults; but after they are all removed, and all his adversaries subdued, he will give peace and rest unto his churches and people all the world over: and herein, and in that season, which now approacheth, lies the accomplishment of all the promises concerning the glorious and peaceable estate of the church in this world. Take, then, this prophecy in what sense soever it may be literally expounded, and there is nothing in it that gives the least countenance unto the Judaical pretence from the words.

16. The next collection of promises which they insist upon to their purpose, is of those which intimate the *destruction of idolatry and false worship* in the world, with the abundance of the knowledge of the Lord, taking away all diversity in religion, that shall be in the days of the Messiah. Such is that of Jer. xxxi. 34, "They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD." And Zeph. iii. 9, "I will turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the LORD, to serve him with one consent." As likewise that of Zech. xiv. 9, "And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name shall be one." And sundry other predictions there are of the same importance, all which are to be accomplished at the coming of the Messiah. "But for the present we see," say they, "the contrary prevailing in the world. Idolatry is still continued, and that among the Christians themselves; diversities of religion abound, so that there are now more sects and opinions in the world; nor can the Jews and Christians agree in this very matter about the Messiah: all which make it evident that he is not yet come who shall put an end to all this state of things."

17. *Ans.* It will prove in the issue that the mention of these, as well as of other promises, will turn to their disadvantage. Their accomplishment, in the sense of the Scripture, hath been so plain, evident, and manifest, that nothing but prejudice and obstinate blindness can once call it into question. For the further manifestation hereof we may observe,—(1.) That these things are not spoken *absolutely*, but *comparatively*. It is not to be thought that in the days of the Messiah there shall be no means of instruction in the knowledge of the Lord used; as that parents should not teach their children and the officers of the church and others those that stand in need of teaching: for neither do the Jews indeed imagine any such thing, nor can they do so without the rejection of the precepts of the law of Moses and the predictions recorded in the prophets, wherein God promiseth that in those days he will give the people pastors after his own heart, priests and Levites, to teach them his mind and will. But this is that which is signified in these expressions,—namely, that in those days there shall be such a plentiful effusion of the Spirit of wisdom and grace as shall cause the true saving knowledge of God to be more easily obtained, and much more plentifully to abound, than it did in the time of the law, when the people, by a hard yoke and insupportable burden of carnal ordinances, were darkly, meanly, and difficultly instructed in some part of the knowledge of God. And that the words are thus to be interpreted, the many promises that are given concerning the instruction of the church in the days of the Messiah, and his own office of being the great prophet of the church, which the Jews acknowledge, do undeniably evince. (2.) That the terms, "all people," and "nations," are necessarily to be understood, as before explained, for many nations, those in an especial manner in whom the church of Christ is concerned; neither can any one place be produced where an *absolute universality* of them is intended. (3.) That the season of the accomplishment of these and the like predictions is not limited to the day or year of the Messiah's coming, as the Jews, amongst other impossible fictions, imagine, but extends itself unto the whole duration of the kingdom of the Messiah, as hath been showed before. (4.) That God sometimes is said to *do* that which he maketh provision of outward means for the effecting of, though, as to some persons and times, they may be frustrated of their effect. And this the Jews not only acknowledge, but also contend for, when they give an account why the promises which concern themselves are not yet fulfilled; the reason whereof they suppose, or at least pretend, to lie in their sin and unworthiness.

18. These things being supposed, we may quickly see what was the event as to those promises upon the coming of the true and only Messiah: for,—(1.) It is known to all, and not denied by those with whom we have to do, that at the coming of Jesus of Nazareth,

setting aside that knowledge and worship of God which was in Judea, a little corner of the earth,—and that also, by their own confession, then horribly defiled and profaned,—the whole world, especially the greatest and most potent and flourishing nations of it, and in particular the whole Roman empire, especially concerned in these predictions, was utterly ignorant of the true God, and engaged in the worship of idols and devils, and that from time immemorial. (2.) That although the Jews had taken great pains, and compassed sea and land to make proselytes, yet they were very few, and those very obscure persons, whom they could at any time or in any place prevail withal to receive the knowledge or give up themselves unto the worship of the God of Israel; of converting people or nations unto his obedience, they never entertained the least hope. (3.) It is manifest to all the world, that not only upon the coming of Jesus, but also by virtue of his law and doctrine, all the *old idolatry* of the world was destroyed; and that whole fabric of superstition which Satan had been so many ages engaged in the erection of was cast to the ground, and those gods of the earth which the nations worshipped utterly famished. Hence it is come to pass at this day, that no people or nation under heaven doth continue to worship those gods which the old empires of the world adored as their deities, and in whose service they waged war against the God of Israel and his people. And all that knowledge that is at this day in the world of one true living God, and the reception of the God of Israel for that true God, however abused, as it is by some Mohammedans and others, did originally proceed from the doctrine of Jesus Christ, whom these ungrateful people hate and persecute. Had it not been for him and his gospel, the *true God*, the *God of their forefathers*, had been no more owned in the world at this day than he was at his coming in the flesh; and yet these poor blinded creatures can see no glory in him or in his ministry. (4.) The Lord Jesus Christ, by his Spirit and word, did not only destroy *idolatry* and *false worship* in the world, but also brought the greatest and most potent nations of it to the knowledge of God; so that, in comparison of what was past, it covered the earth "as the waters cover the sea." This the Jews saw and repined at, in the flourishing times of the Roman empire, when "the LORD was one, and his name one" in the whole earth, as that expression is used in the Scripture. (5.) The *way* whereby this knowledge and worship of the true God was dispersed over the face of the earth, and spread itself like an inundation of saving waters over the world, was by such a secret energy of the Spirit of Christ accompanying his word and the ministration of it, that it wholly differed from that operose, burdensome, and, for the most part, ineffectual way of teaching which was used by the priests, Levites, and scribes of old; there being much more of the

efficacy of grace than of the pains of the teachers seen in the effects wrought and produced, according to the words of the promise, Jer. xxxi. 34. (6.) In this diffusion of the knowledge of God, there was way made for the union, agreement, and joint consent in worship, of those that should receive it,—for both the partition wall between Jews and Gentiles was removed, and both people did actually coalesce into one body, worshipping God with one lip and shoulder, —and also an holy and plain way of spiritual worship was prescribed unto all that did or should embrace the law of the Messiah. (7.) Notwithstanding all that hath been already accomplished, yet there is still room and time left and remaining for the further accomplishment of these predictions; so that before the close of the kingdom of the Messiah, not one tittle of them shall fall to the ground. And thus also the open event, known to all the world, doth manifest the due and full accomplishment of these promises, making it unquestionable that the Messiah is long since come, and hath fulfilled the work that he was designed of old unto.

19. Neither are the exceptions of the Jews of any force to invalidate our application of these promises. Two things they object unto us;—first, The *idolatry* that is yet in the world, *especially among Christians;* secondly, The differences in religion that everywhere abound amongst men. For, (1.) We have showed already that these and the like predictions are to have a gradual accomplishment, not all at once, in every place. It is sufficient that there is an everlasting foundation laid for the destruction of all false worship; which having had a conspicuous and glorious effect in the most eminent nations of the world, sufficient to answer the intention of the prophecy, shall yet further, in the appointed seasons, root out the remainder of all superstition and apostasy from God. (2.) For what concerns Christians themselves, it cannot be denied but that many who are so called have corrupted themselves, and contracted the guilt of that horrible iniquity which they charge upon them; but this being the crime and guilt of some certain persons, and not of the whole society of the professors of Christianity, ought not to be objected unto them. And I desire to know by what means the Jews suppose that themselves and the nations of the world shall be kept from idolatry and false worship in the days of their Messiah. If it be because their Messiah shall give such a perfect law, and such full instructions in the mind and will of God, that all men may clearly know their duty, we say that this is already done in the highest degree of perfection that is conceivable. But what if, notwithstanding this, men will follow their own vain reasonings and imaginations, and fall from the rule of their obedience into will-worship and superstition, what remedy have they provided against such backsliding? If they have none, but only the pressing

upon them their duty to the law, word, and institutions of God, we have the same, and do make use of it to the same end and purpose. If they shall say that their Messiah will kill them and slay them with the sword, we confess that ours is not of that mind; and desire them to take heed, lest, in the room of the holy, humble, merciful King promised to the church, they look for and desire a bloody tyrant, that shall exercise force over the minds of men, and execute their revenge and lusts on those whom they like not. (3.) This *apostasy* of some professors of Christianity into false worship, idolatry, and persecution, is foretold obscurely in the *writings of the Old Testament itself*, but most plainly in those of the Gospel, or revelations made by the Lord Christ unto his apostles concerning the state of the church unto the end of the world; so that from thence no impeachment can arise against our interpretation of the predictions insisted on, which have a perfect coincidence therewithal. (4.) The same is the state of things in reference unto what they object about the *variety* of religions that are in the world, and the multitude of sects which everywhere spring up; for,—[1.] Although *de facto* there are at this time sundry *false religions* in the world,—and amongst them that which is professed by the Jews,—yet *de jure* they ought not to be, there being but one true religion, sufficiently declared and promulgated unto the children of men; for whereas the Jews and others do wilfully shut their eyes against the light and evidence of truth, the guilt and misery are their own, the Lord Christ having graciously provided and tendered unto them means of better instruction. And, [2.] It is a mistake, that the different opinions and sects that are amongst Christians themselves do constitute different religions; for as they all agree in the worship of the *God of Israel by Jesus Christ, the Messiah*,—which contains the sum of their religion,—so their profession itself is not to be measured by the doctrines and conceptions of some amongst them, but by the Scripture which they all receive and acknowledge. This is the religion of them all; and it is one and the same amongst all that receive Jesus Christ for their Saviour. That there are such pertinacious contests about men's different apprehensions of the mind of God in the word, that they labour to impose their private conceptions one upon another, is the fault of some men, but which doth not prejudice the oneness of that religion which is taught in the gospel. Upon all which it appears that the promises insisted on have received a glorious and blessed accomplishment.

20. Thirdly, They insist on the promises which concern themselves; and these of all others they most mind and urge against their adversaries. Nothing, they say, is more certain and evident in the Scripture, than that the people of Israel shall be brought into a blessed and prosperous condition by the Messiah at his coming;

and, in particular, that by him they shall be brought home into their own land: and to this purpose they plead, Isa. xi. 12, lii. liv., lx.–lxiii., lxvi.; Jer. xxx., xxxi.; Ezek. xxxvi.–xlviii.; whereunto sundry other places of a like importance may be added. But now, say they, instead hereof, that whole people is scattered over the face of the earth, under great misery and oppression for the most part, without the least interest in the country promised unto them. And from hence it is that they most obstinately conclude that the Messiah is not yet come; for until they are rich, wealthy, and powerful, they will not believe that God is faithful.

21. *Ans.* It would be too long a work, and not suitable unto our present design, to go over all the promises in particular which seem to have an aspect this way, or wherein mention is made of Abraham, the seed of Abraham, Jacob, Israel, and the people of Israel and Judah. Besides, the exposition of them may readily be got from many learned commentaries extant in all languages on the prophecies of the Old Testament. I shall therefore only give such general answers, as, being applied unto the several particular instances, will manifest the insufficiency of the Jews' argument from promises of this nature. (1.) Then, in the consideration of these promises, we must carefully distinguish between those which had their *full*, at least *principal*, accomplishment in the return of the people from the captivity of Babylon, and those which have a *direct respect* unto the days of the Messiah. It is known that the prophets do very usually set out that merciful deliverance in metaphorical expressions, so as to set off the greatness of the mercy itself. But the present Jews, who now look for the accomplishing of all the most *strained allegories* in a literal sense, supposing that the deliverance which their forefathers then obtained, because of their ensuing trouble and poverty, did not answer what is spoken of it, do wrest them all to the times of the Messiah, when they hope they shall receive them in full measure; for they reckon all things according to their outward gain and profit, and not according to the manifestation of the love and glory of God therein. These promises, then, are in the first place to be set apart, as not concerned in our present business and difference. (2.) We have manifested before that there is mention of a double Israel in the Scripture;—*the spiritual Israel*, that is, all the sons of the faith of Abraham, in all ages and places throughout the world; and *an Israel according to the flesh*, or the carnal posterity of Jacob, which the present Jews are. This distinction we have elsewhere confirmed. Now, many of the promises pleaded belong to Israel in the first sense; that is, the church and people of God, who by faith are admitted into the covenant of Abraham, and so made inheritors of the promises. And these also, which are by far the greatest number, are to be set aside from our present con-

sideration of them. (3.) It hath been proved that oftentimes spiritual things are expressed *metaphorically* in the prophets,—by words which, in their literal, first sense, denote things outward and corporeal. This is sufficiently evident from the instances formerly given, wherein such things are spoken as it is utterly impossible that they should have a literal accomplishment; and of the like sort there are others innumerable. And thus most of the predictions that concern peace and prosperity must necessarily intend *spiritual peace with God*, because, concerning the same seasons, wars and trials are in other places foretold. (4.) Whatever is foretold and promised concerning the Jews themselves in the days of the Messiah, doubtless they have no ground nor colour of reason to expect the accomplishment of it until they receive him, own him, and submit unto him; which to this day they have not done. When Moses went forth to visit them of old in their distress, and slew the Egyptian that smote one of them, because they refused him, and would not understand that it was he whom God would deliver them by, and endeavoured to betray him to death, their bondage was continued forty years longer; and yet at length by the same Moses were they delivered; and although they have refused and rejected him who was promised to be their Saviour, and so continue to this day in their captivity, spiritual and temporal, yet it is he by whom, in the time appointed, they shall be delivered from the one and the other. But this shall not be done until they own and receive him: which when God shall give them hearts to do, they will quickly find the blessed success thereof; for,—(5.) We grant that there are many promises on record in the Scripture concerning their gathering together, their return to God by the Messiah, with the great peace and glory that shall ensue thereupon. Set aside their opinion concerning the perpetuity of the *ceremonial law*, and their return, in the observation of it, unto their carnal ordinances, built on a supposition that God is pleased with the blood of bulls and goats for its own sake, and not as a signification of that which was infinitely more excellent and glorious,—an apprehension which the whole world hath, as it were by joint consent, long ago renounced; and cast away the vain and foolish imaginations about their sensual pleasures, behemoth, the wine of paradise, and literal accomplishment of professed allegories, which the wisest among themselves begin to be ashamed of; and there is nothing in their own expectations but we acknowledge that they shall be made partakers of it. Return they shall to their own land, to enjoy it for a quiet and everlasting possession, their adversaries being destroyed; filled they shall be also with the light and knowledge of the will and worship of God, so as to be a guide and blessing unto the residue of the Gentiles who shall seek after the Lord; and, it may be, be intrusted with great empire and rule in the world. The most of these

things are foretold concerning them, not only in their own prophetical writings, but also by the divine writers of sundry books of the New Testament. But all this, we say, must come to pass when the veil shall be taken from before their eyes, and when "they shall look on him whom they have pierced," and joyfully receive him whom they have sinfully rejected for so many generations. Until this be done, they may wrestle as they can with their own perplexities, and comfort themselves as well as they are able in their miseries, and get money in their dispersions by all unlawful arts and ways imaginable, and expose themselves to the delusions of impostors, false prophets, and pretenders to be their deliverers,—which, to their unspeakable misery and reproach, they have now done ten times;—deliverance, peace, tranquillity, acceptance with God and man, they shall not obtain. Here lies the crisis of their condition: When they shall receive, acknowledge, and believe in, that Messiah who came so long time since unto them, whom their fathers wickedly slew and hanged on a tree, and whom themselves have since no less wickedly rejected; and when, by his Spirit and grace, they shall be turned from ungodliness, and shall have their eyes opened to see the mystery of the grace, wisdom, and love of God in the blood of his Son;—then shall they obtain mercy from the God of their forefathers, and returning again into their own land, "Jerusalem shall be inhabited again, even in Jerusalem."

EXERCITATION XIX.

STATE AND ORDINANCES OF THE CHURCH BEFORE THE GIVING OF THE LAW.

1, 2. Ordinances and institutions of the Jewish church referred to and unfolded in the Epistle to the Hebrews—Principal heads of them mentioned therein. 3. The call of Abraham. Heb. xi. 8–19. 4. The name Abram; signification of it—Changed into Abraham; its signification—The foundation of the church in his posterity. 5. The time of his birth and death. 6. Ur of the Chaldees, where; and Haran—Extent of Mesopotamia—Moses and Stephen reconciled. 7. Abraham, before his call infected with idolatry. 8, 9. Time of his call. 10. Institution of circumcision—End and use of it. 11. Time of the Israelites' sojourning in Egypt—Gen. xv. 13; Exod. xii. 40, 41; Acts vii. 6; Gal. iii. 17, reconciled—The beginning and ending of the four hundred and thirty years. 12. The fatal period of changes in the Jewish church. 13. Institution of the passover. 14. The time of its celebration—The month. 15. Time of the day—בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, "between the two evenings," when. 16. The occasion and nature of this ordinance—The matter of it—The manner of its observance—Sundry things, suited to its first celebration, not afterwards observed—The number required at the eating of the lamb—By whom it was killed—Where—How dressed—Jewish traditions rejected. 17. The feast of unleavened bread—Its rites. 18. Excision, to the neglect

of what ordinances annexed. 19. Jews acknowledge the figurative nature of this ordinance. 20. Of frontlets or phylacteries, Exod. xiii. 9—Signs and memorials—The sections of the law written in the frontlets. 21. The Jews' manner of making their phylacteries—Deceit therein—Their trust in them reproved by our Saviour—Of their fringes, their appointment, making, and use. 22. Dedication of the first-born males to God—Price of the redemption of children. 23. Close of God's first dispensation towards that church. 24 The solemn *νομοθεσία*. 25. Preparations for it—*Remote* preparations; occasional, temporary institutions between the Red Sea and Sinai—Of the waters of Marah. 26. The giving of manna—Derivation and signification of the name. 27, 28. Water brought out of the rock—That rock Christ. 29. *Immediate* preparations for the receiving of the law—The time that the people came to Sinai—The day. 30. The time of the day that the appearances of God's glory began—The same time that Christ rose from the dead. 31. The place—Sinai the name of the mountain, Horeb of the wilderness—Of the monastery there. 32. Moses' first ascent—The ground of it. 33. The people prepared by the remembrance of mercies and promises. 34. What required of the people. 35. Of their washing their clothes—Not a baptism of standing use. 36. Bounds set unto the mount. 37. In what sense it might be touched, Heb. xii. 18. 38–40. How the offender was to be punished—נגע, opened. 41–43. The station and order of the people in receiving of the law. 44, 45. The ministry of angels in the preparations for God's glorious presence—How the people met God, and God them. 46. When Moses used these words, "I exceedingly fear and quake," Heb. xii. 21.

1. THERE are in the Epistle [of Paul] unto the Hebrews either direct discourses concerning, or occasional mention is made of all, or at least the most important things in the whole Mosaical economy, and state of the church and worship of God therein under the old testament; yea, there is nothing material, from the call of Abraham unto the utmost issue of God's dispensations towards his posterity, that is omitted by him. And if we have not a previous acquaintance with these things, which he supposed in them to whom he wrote, much darkness and many mistakes must needs attend us in the consideration of what he treateth on, and the ends which he proposeth unto himself. Now, because it will no way be expedient, every time the mention of them doth occur, or allusion is made unto them, to insist upon them as first instituted, I thought meet, in the close of these prolegomena, to present the reader with a brief scheme and delineation of the whole *Mosaical economy*, as also of those other previous concernments of the church, in the posterity of Abraham, which by the apostle in this Epistle we are called and directed unto. And they are these that follow:—1. The *call and obedience of Abraham*, chap. xi. 8–19. 2. The institution and observation of the *passover*, chap. xi. 28. 3. The giving of the *law*, chap. i. 1, ii. 1, xii. 18–21, 25, 26. 4. The sanction of the law in *promises* and *penalties*, chap. ii. 2, iii., iv., x. 28. 5. The building of the *tabernacle* in the wilderness, and afterwards of the *temple* in answer thereunto, chap. iii. 3, 4, ix. 1–5, x. 19–22, with its utensils. 6. The calling, succession, and office of the *high priest*, chap.

vii. 16, 17, 21, 23, viii. 3–5. 7. The *sacrifices* and services of them both, chap. viii. 3–5, ix. 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, x. 1–6, 11, xiii. 11, 12.

It is plain and evident, that under these heads all the principal concernments of the ancient church, with the worship and rule of God therein, are comprised; and they are all of them reflected on, most of them explained and applied unto gospel ends, by our apostle. However, I shall not, in our present consideration of them, engage in the exposition of the particular places in the Epistle where they are treated on, which is to be done elsewhere, but only represent them as they are expressed in their institution and transaction in the Old Testament, so to make way unto a right conception of them as they are mentioned and made use of in the New.

2. Many of these things, I acknowledge, especially those concerning the temple, its fabric and its worship, have been so largely discussed by others, as that I should judge my endeavours in a review of them altogether needless, would the nature of our present design admit of its forbearance; for besides what hath been formerly attempted with excellent success, with reference unto the fabric of divine worship and the ceremonies thereof, from the Scripture, Josephus, and the later Jewish masters, by Abubensci, Arias Montanus, Villalpandus, Cappellus, Ribera, Constantine l'Empereur, Broughton, Ainsworth, Wemyss, Rivet, and all learned expositors on those parts of holy writ where these things are recorded, there are also some of late who amongst ourselves have travailed with much diligence in this subject,—persons worthily skilled in and industriously improving their knowledge of all that learning which is needful unto the due and accurate handling of this subject, and that in large discourses. But as things are fallen out, considering the necessity of this discourse unto my present design, and that most of the things in our proposal from the Epistle above mentioned are such as fell not under the consideration of those learned persons, nor are handled by them, and that I design not an exact examination of the particular concernments of all these things, with a discussion of the reasons and arguments wherewith various apprehensions of them are attested, but only to represent such a scheme of them unto the reader as may enable him to judge aright of the references of the apostle unto them, and of the use that he puts them unto, I shall proceed in my designed way.

3. First, then, The *call of Abraham*, which was the foundation whereon all the following administrations of God towards his posterity and his whole worship amongst them were built, is excellently and fully described by our apostle, chap. xi. 8–19: "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went." (Gen. xii. 1–4.) "By faith he sojourned in

the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." (Gen. xii. xiii. xiv.) "Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised." (Gen. xvii. 19, xxi. 2.) "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable." (Gen. xv. 5, xxii. 17.) "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." (Gen. xxiii. 4, xlvii. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 15.) "For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned." (Gen. xxiv. 5–7.) "But now they desire a better, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath prepared for them a city. By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and" (or "even") "he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son, of whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called,"—so that he was his only-begotten with respect unto the promise,—(Gen. xxi. 12, xxii. 9): "accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure."

The design of the apostle in this discourse, is to set forth and commend the faith of Abraham, from the fruits and effects of it, in the whole course of his obedience; but he builds it upon and resolves it into his call: "By faith Abraham, when he was CALLED," etc. Neither is it my present purpose to open particularly the discourse of the apostle, which must be referred to its proper place; only, because what we do now is in a subserviency unto the right understanding of this Epistle, I have laid down this account, given us therein, of the call of Abraham, and his faith and obedience, shown as the reason of our insisting on it, and the foundation whereon what we do therein is built. Neither shall I now at large declare the nature of this call of Abraham, with the several occurrences that accompanied it; partly because it is already touched upon in a former Exercitation; and partly because I have elsewhere handled it more largely, and cleared it from the corrupt traditions and opinions of the Jews concerning it. But because this was the root on which the Judaical church did grow, the stock whereinto all *Mosaical institutions* of worship were inserted and grafted, it is necessary that we give a brief historical account concerning it.

4. Abraham, he was first called by his parents אַבְרָם, "Abram,"—

that is, "an high father,"—not without a signal presaging providence of God; for as of old they gave *significant names* unto their children, so therein they had respect unto their present condition, or some prospect they had given them by the Spirit of God of things future, wherein they or theirs should be concerned. So have we the reasons given us of the names of Cain, Gen. iv. 1; of Seth, verse 25; of Noah, chap. v. 29; of Peleg, chap. x. 25; and of sundry others. And if we may not suppose that the parents of Abraham were directed to give him this name of "an high father" by the Spirit of prophecy, yet, considering its suitableness unto what God had designed him for, and its readiness to yield unto that *change* which God made afterwards in it, unto a great strengthening of his faith and significancy in a way of instruction unto future generations, we must grant that it was done by the designing, holy, wise providence of God; for he was "an high father" indeed, as being the father of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the flesh. In process of time, upon the solemn establishment of the covenant with him, God changed this name of אַבְרָם into אַבְרָהָם: Gen. xvii. 5, "Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham." And on the like account did God also change the names of some other persons, or superadded new names unto those whereby they were called before; as of Israel unto Jacob, Gen. xxxii. 28, upon his prevalency with God as a prince; Jedidiah unto Solomon, 2 Sam. xii. 25, because the Lord loved him. And many, doubtless, had new names given unto them by themselves or others, or some letter or syllable changed in their names, withal altering their signification, upon emergent occasions. Hence have we so many in the Old Testament whom we find in several places expressed by divers names, or varied in one place from another. Now, this change in the name of Abraham was not, as the Jews fancy, to honour him with the addition of a letter out of the Tetragrammaton, but for the addition of a new prophetical significancy unto it, as God himself expressly declares, "Thy name shall be אַבְרָהָם כִּי אַב־הֲמוֹן גּוֹיִם נְתַתִּיךָ,"—"Abraham, for a father of a multitude of nations have I made thee;" according as he said before, Gen. xvii. 4, "Thou shalt be a father of a multitude of nations," הָם in his name denoting הֲמוֹן, "a multitude," that is, of nations, God himself expounding his own intention and design. And herein is a solemn prefiguration of the implanting of believers of all nations into the covenant and faith of Abraham; for this name he received upon the solemn establishment of the covenant with him, as the apostle explains the place, Rom. iv. 11–17. All, then, that believe are taken into the covenant of Abraham; and as unto the privileges of it, and inheritance to be obtained by it, they are no less his children and heirs than those who proceeded from his loins according to the flesh; as hath been manifested in our Exercitation

concerning the oneness of the church. And herein also God manifested what was his design in his call and separation unto himself, even to make and constitute him and his posterity the means of bringing forth the promised Seed, wherein all nations were to be blessed.

5. Abraham being the tenth generation from Noah, exclusive, was the son of Terah, of whom it is said, Gen. xi. 26, that "Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran;" not doubtless in the same year, but then the eldest of them was born, whoever he was. If Abraham was the eldest, as he is first expressed, he was born two hundred and ninety-two years after the flood, in the three hundred and ninety-second year of the life of Shem, who outlived him thirty-five years; and he was the sixth from Eber, born in the two hundred and twenty-fifth year of his age, who, continuing longest of all the postdiluvian patriarchs, outlived Abraham about sixty-four years. But there is a difficulty in this account; for if Abraham was born in the seventieth year of the age of Terah, Terah living in all two hundred and five years, Abraham at the death of Terah must needs be one hundred and thirty-five years of age. But the Scripture saith expressly that at his departure out of Haran, upon the death of his father, he was no more but seventy-five years old. And if he was seventy-five years old at the death of his father, who lived two hundred and five years, he must be born in the one hundred and thirtieth of his father's life, and not before, which carries on his birth and death sixty years beyond the former account. So that he outlived Shem twenty-five years, and died only four years before Eber. Although, therefore, he be mentioned before Haran, Gen. xi. 26, yet, indeed, Haran was the eldest son of Terah, and born before Abraham sixty years. And it appears in the story that Lot and Sarah, who were the children of Haran (if Sarah was the Iscah mentioned, as most suppose she was, Gen. xi. 29), were not much younger than Abraham himself; for when Abraham was an hundred years old, Sarah was ninety, Gen. xvii. 17, and Lot may well be supposed to be older than she: so that of necessity Haran must be many years older than Abraham, even no less than sixty, as we have declared.

6. His nativity and education was in Ur of the Chaldees, Gen. xi. 28, 31. This place is said to be "on the *other side* of the flood," הַנָּהָר, or "the *river*," Josh. xxiv. 2; that is, from the land of Canaan, on the other side of the great river Euphrates eastward. It was so also of Tigris, on the east of Aram Naharaim, or Mesopotamia properly so called (which is not insisted on), because Abraham came over Tigris unto Haran with his father Terah. "He came," saith Stephen, "out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran," Acts vii. 4. He says, indeed, that before he came unto Charran he dwelt in Mesopotamia, verse 2; wherein also Haran lay,

for the name of Mesopotamia was given of old unto all the adjacent regions, even unto the Persian Sea. So doth Pliny evidently, lib. vi. cap. xxvi., "Mesopotamia tota Assyriorum fuit vicatim dispersa, præter Babylona et Ninum;"—"All Mesopotamia belonged unto the Assyrians, and consisted of scattered villages, unless it were Babylonia and the country about Nineveh." And again, "Reliqua pars Mesopotamiæ Assyriæque Babylonia appellata est." So that he equals Mesopotamia with Assyria; which how great a tract of those regions it comprehended is manifest from Ptolemy, Strabo, and others. Eupolemus in Eusebius, Præparat. Evang. lib. ix., placeth Οὐρία, Ura, in Babylonia; and there also Pliny mentioneth Ura upon the banks of Euphrates, lib. v. cap. xxiv., "Fertur Euphrates usque ad Uram." But this seems not to be the Ur where Abraham dwelt; nor was there any reason that in a design for Canaan he should remove from any part of Babylonia upon Euphrates unto Haran. It is more likely to be the place mentioned by Ammianus, lib. xv., where he says that the Romans in six days came from Corduene in Armenia, "ad Ur nomine, Persicum castellum,"—"unto Ur, a Persian castle." And this he placeth between Nisibis and Tigris, and was not far from the place where it is probably supposed that the ark rested after the flood, the family of Eber keeping their first seat, not accompanying the בְּנֵי הָאָדָם, or "sons of men," Gen. xi. 2–5, those wicked apostates who went from the east to find a place to fix the seat of their rebellion against God. Broughton contendeth that Ur was in the vale of the Chaldeans,—that is, in Babylonia,—a very little way, or some few miles from Haran, averring that Stephen cannot otherwise be defended, who affirms that he was in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran. But as this defence of Stephen is needless, seeing, as we have manifested, he took Mesopotamia in a large sense, as others did also, giving the same extent unto it with Assyria, the denomination arising from the most eminent and fruitful of these regions; so the removal of a little way or a few miles answereth not that description which the Holy Ghost gives us of this journey: Gen. xi. 31, "And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran, ... and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came unto Haran, and dwelt there." Their design was to go unto Canaan. And as the Ura which was in Babylonia was situated on this side of Euphrates, as Pliny testifies,—so that Abraham could not go from thence unto Canaan by Haran but he must twice needlessly pass with all his family over Euphrates,—so the expression of their journeying to Haran will not suit unto any imaginary Ur within a few miles of it. Nor is it of any weight that it is called "Ur of the Chaldees," whose proper seat was in Babylonia, and extended not much farther eastward; seeing if the Chaldees, as is most probable, were called Chas-

dim, as they are constantly, from כֶּשֶׂד, "Chesed," Gen. xxii. 22, the son of Nahor, the brother of Abraham, there must of necessity be allowed an historical prolepsis in the words, and so that is called "Ur of the Chaldees" from whence the Chaldees were afterwards to have their original, who in time possessed Babylonia and the parts adjacent.

7. Whilst Abraham lived with his progenitors in Ur, there is no doubt but he was, with them, infected with much false worship and idolatry; for so Joshua affirms expressly that they served אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, chap. xxiv. 2, even those whose worship God afterwards prohibited in the first precept of the law, לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים;—"There shall not be unto thee other gods;" those, or such as those, whom they served beyond the flood. "Other gods" are all false gods. The Jews' imagination about the discovery made by Abraham of the true God, his renunciation of all idolatry thereon, with the breaking of his father's images, and his being cast for that cause by Nimrod into the fire, all about the forty-fourth year of his age, I have considered and exploded elsewhere. And all these figments, with that of Haran's being consumed by fire in the sight of his father, they wire-draw from the supposed signification of the name אוּר, which they would have to signify "fire," Gen. xi. 28; but as, where it relates unto the Chaldeans ("Ur of the Chaldees") it is apparently the name of a place, a town, or country, so it rather signifies a valley than fire. And these words, Isa. xxiv. 15, עַל־כֵּן בָּאֻרִים כַּבְּדוּ יְהוָה, which we translate in the text, "Wherefore glorify ye the LORD in the fires," may be better read, as in the margin, "in the valleys;" which better answers unto the following words, "And the name of the LORD God of Israel in the isles of the sea." At what year of his age he left Ur with his father is not expressed, but it is apparent that it was towards the latter end of the life of Terah, even after the death of Haran his eldest son, and that Nahor and Abraham were married to Milcah and Iscah his daughters, and Sarah had continued barren some remarkable space of time, Gen. xi. 28–32.

8. From Ur, therefore, with his father and the rest of their family, he removed to Haran with a design for Canaan, Gen. xi. 31. Where this Haran was situated we before declared. Stephen calls it Χαῤῥάν, "Charran;" and so do the Latin writers.

"Assyrias Latio maculavit sanguine Charras,"

says Lucan of the overthrow of Crassus' army near that place; and it may be pronounced either way in the original, from the ambiguous force of the Hebrew Cheth, but it seems best expressed by Charran. How long he stayed here is uncertain, as was said before. That it was not very long, appears from his marrying, and the barrenness of Sarah, before he came thither. And yet that they abode there some years is no less evident from chap. xii. 5, "Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their substance

that they had gathered, and the souls" (or "servants") "that they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan." It is not the work of a few days or months that is here described. This gathering of substance and getting of souls was a business of some years, of how many it is uncertain. What was the design of Terah, in his attempt to go to the land of Canaan, is not absolutely certain. The especial call of Abraham unto that country could not be the bottom of it; for it is most probable, yea, indeed undeniable, that this he had not until after the death of Terah. It was, therefore, an act of theirs in answer to the providence of God, in a subserviency unto that future call, that he might be in more readiness to yield obedience unto it than he could have been in the land of Ur. Whether Terah did merely seek a new habitation, in a country less peopled than that of his nativity, which doubtless then was the most populous part of the world, as being near the place where mankind first planted after the flood; or whether he might be instructed in the ancient promise, that the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, who then possessed the country called after his name, should be servants unto the seed of Shem, from whom Terah was a principal descendant, I know not. In answer to the call of Abraham it could not be; for he was called to *leave his father's house*, chap. xii. 1, and not to bring his father his household with him, and that at the seventy-fifth year of his age, when Terah was dead. But whatever was the occasion of it, the providence of God used it in the serving of its designs towards Abraham. And here in Haran, if I may be allowed to conjecture, it is probable that God gave him light into the evil of those superstitions wherein he was educated, revealed himself as the only true God, and so prepared him for his call unto the tedious journeying and long peregrination that ensued thereon.

9. When his father Terah was dead, and himself seventy-five years old, Gen. xii. 1–4, God called him to himself, and entered into covenant with him in the promise of the land of Canaan, verse 7. And this call of his was the great foundation whereon God afterwards built the whole structure of his worship under the old testament; for herein he both appropriated the promise of the Messiah unto him,—designing his person as the spring from which he should proceed according to the flesh,—and set him and his posterity apart, to be visibly subservient unto the great design of his grace, in the accomplishment of the promise of a deliverer made unto our first parents. This we have elsewhere at large declared, and showed how that after his call every thing was disposed unto a significancy of that which was for to come, and was suited for a continuance unto that season, and no longer.

10. When Abraham was ninety and nine years old,—that is, after

he had been twenty-four years in the land of Canaan,—the Lord confirmed his covenant with him and his seed by the sign and token of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 7–13: which Paul calls "the seal of the righteousness of faith," Rom. iv. 11; because God thereby confirmed and assured unto him an interest in the promised Seed, who is "the LORD our righteousness," Isa. xlv. 24, 25, Jer. xxiii. 6; and because he had accepted of the righteousness and salvation which in and by him God had prepared for sinners, in believing the promise, Gen. xv. 6. And herein did God manifest that he took his seed together with him into the covenant, as those who, no less than himself, were to be made partakers of the righteousness exhibited therein, as also to be used for the channel where the holy seed was to be carried on, until the Word was to take it and to be made flesh, John i. 14; Matt. i. 1; Rom. ix. 5. And by this ordinance of *circumcision* were his posterity separated from the rest of the world and united among themselves; for however Ishmael and Esau carried the outward sign of circumcision out of the pale and limits of the church, communicating it unto the nations that sprang of them unto this day, unto whose observance they also adhere (who, being of another extract, have received the law of Mohammed, who was of the offspring of persecuting Ishmael, as the Turks and Persians, with very many of the Indians), yet their observance of it was never under the law of God, nor accepted with him, but is rather accursed by him. But as it was continued in the posterity of Abraham, according unto the promise, it was the fundamental uniting principle of the church amongst them, though dispersed into innumerable particular families. For as there were as many churches before as there were families, *ecclesiastical* and *economical* or paternal rule being the same, now, the covenant being one, and the token of the covenant being one and the same, unto all the families that sprang of Abraham, which in their several generations were as the sand of the sea-shore, or as the stars for multitude, they were incorporated into *one body* among themselves, and separated from all the rest of the world. Not that this ordinance alone was sufficient to constitute the whole nation one ecclesiastical body or church, which was done by the following institutions of worship, but that the foundation thereof was first laid herein. Neither without some such general initiation into union could it have been orderly accomplished. And as it was the glory of the people of old, whilst they walked in the steps of the faith of Abraham, so it was the carnal boast of their degenerate posterity. Hence have we so often mention of those who were "uncircumcised," in the way of reproach and contempt; and when they renewed the administration of it among themselves, upon their first entrance into the land of Canaan, after its omission in the wilderness, it is said that "they rolled away the reproach of Egypt," Josh. v. 9, because

they were now no more as the Egyptians, *uncircumcised.* And it was their glory, both because God made it the token of his receiving them to be his peculiar people out of all the nations of the earth, as also because it was the pledge of their obedience unto God; which is the glory of any person or people. But their posterity, being *carnal,* and degenerating from the faith and obedience of Abraham, having quite lost the grace betokened by it,—which, as Moses often declares unto them, was *the circumcision of their hearts* to hear and obey the voice of God,—did yet, and do yet to this day, boast of it as a sign of their separation unto God from other people; not considering that these things were mutual, answering one another, and that this latter is nothing when the former is not also attended unto.

11. And these are the chief heads that are looked upon by our apostle in the call of Abraham; which also we have been more brief in the explication of, because its consideration hath elsewhere occurred unto us. Now, from this call of Abraham unto the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Egypt, was, as Moses assures us, four hundred and thirty years, Exod. xii. 40, 41; and so saith our apostle, Gal. iii. 17. But because the Lord tells Abraham that his posterity should be afflicted in a strange land four hundred years, Gen. xv. 13,—which words are repeated by Stephen in his sermon to the Jews, Acts vii. 6,—the reason of this different account may be briefly inquired after. Here is a double limitation of time;—(1.) Of four hundred and thirty years, by Moses and Paul; (2.) Of four hundred years, by God himself unto Abraham, repeated by Stephen. The words of Moses are recorded Exod. xii. 40, 41, "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass, at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt." It is evident that there is an ambiguity in the words of Moses; for if מוֹשַׁב, "the sojourning," or dwelling, in the beginning of verse 40, do relate unto יָשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם, "dwelt in Egypt," it can design no longer space of time than they dwelt there after the descent of Jacob; which, by an evident computation of the times, containeth but half the space limited of four hundred and thirty years. If it refer only to the "children of Israel," then it takes in all the sojournings and peregrinations of that people "who dwelt in Egypt," from the first day of their being the people of God. Now, this ambiguity is perfectly removed by our apostle, Gal. iii. 16, 17, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. . . . . And the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." The giving of the law was, as we shall see, immediately upon their coming out of Egypt; and saith he, the four hundred and thirty years are to be reckoned from the call of

Abraham, when God first entered into covenant with him, Gen. xii. 1–3. From thence unto the departure out of Egypt and the giving of the law that ensued are four hundred and thirty years. It is evident, then, that by the "sojourning" and peregrination of the children of Israel, not their mere abode in Egypt,—which after their going down, Gen. xlvi., was only two hundred and fifteen years, or thereabouts,—but the whole course of that people after they were in Abraham called from their own country, and a certain habitation therein, until their leaving of Egypt, in order unto their taking possession of the land of Canaan as a perpetual inheritance (that is, commensurate unto the duration of the especial covenant made with them), is intended. It remains, then, that we consider the other space of time assigned by God in vision unto Abraham, for the affliction of his seed under persecution, namely, four hundred years, Gen. xv. 13. Now, herein either the round number of four hundred is put for four hundred and thirty, or thirty years are to be abated out of the latter number, for some special cause and reason. The former seems not probable, because Moses doth so emphatically note that it was in the four hundred and thirtieth year, *that very same day, or night;* and therefore thirty years must be taken off, either from the beginning or end of the latter number. To detract it from the end there is no reason; nor will Moses his exact observation of that period allow us so to do. It must, therefore, be from the beginning. Now, this prediction of God unto Abraham about the affliction or persecution of his seed for four hundred years was given him before the birth of Isaac, who, being of his seed according to the promise, was to have his share in this affliction, yea, it was to begin with him. He was born, as was proved, twenty-five years after the promise, so that the thirty years to be taken off from the four hundred and thirty fall out in the fifth year of his life, which was the time when the persecution began in the mocking of Ishmael, Gen. xxi. 9; which the apostle expressly calleth persecution, and that upon the account of Isaac's being the heir of the promise, Gal. iv. 29. Then began the four hundred years of their affliction, which ended with the four hundred and thirtieth of their peregrination.

12. In the faith of Abraham, manifested in his obedience to the call of God, resting on the promise of the blessing by Christ, and in the observation of the ordinance of circumcision, whereby they were separated unto God and united among themselves, did this people continue, without the addition of any new ordinance of worship for the supportment of their faith, or enlargement of their light, or outward profession of their separation unto God, to the expiration of four hundred and thirty years. And this period of time proved afterwards fatal unto them, not exactly and absolutely, but

in some kind of proportion; for from hence unto the building of the temple by Solomon was four hundred and eighty years. The duration of that temple was four hundred and fifteen years; that of the latter, built in the room thereof, somewhat above five hundred, some peculiar space being given them beyond their former trials, before their utter destruction.

13. At the expiration of the period of time discoursed on, our apostle tells us, Heb. xi. 28, that "through faith Moses kept the passover, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them." This was the second ordinance of common use to the church, and appropriated unto them, which God instituted amongst them. The story of its institution and manner of its celebration are at large insisted on, Exod. xii.

14. The time of its institution and annual celebration is exactly noted in the Scripture. It was the night before the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt; which is thence called הַלַּיְלָה שִׁמֻּרִים, Exod. xii. 42, "a night of observances" unto the LORD; that is, wherein his institutions of this ordinance were to be observed with great care and diligence. And this night fell in directly upon the expiration of the four hundred and thirty years before limited, verses 40, 41. For the time of the year, it was in the month אָבִיב, "Abib," as the Hebrews called the month of the spring which, in those eastern parts, gave blades unto the corn and other fruits of the earth, Exod. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18, Deut. xvi. 1; which afterwards, by a Chaldee name, was called Nisan, Neh. ii. 1, Esth. iii. 7; and it answered partly to our March, partly to April, beginning before or at the vernal equinox, according to the distance of any year from the embolismical year. And from hence this month was appointed to be רֹאשׁ חֳדָשִׁים, the head, chief, or principal of the months, Exod. xii. 2; and so, consequently, the beginning of the year unto them: for before this, their year began and ended in September, upon the gathering in of the fruits of the earth, chap. xxiii. 16; being the time, as most of the present Jews suppose, wherein the world was created. Neither yet was this change absolute unto all ends and purposes, but only as to ecclesiastical observances and feasts that depended on their distance from this of the passover; for their civil year, as to contracts, debts, and liberties, continued still to begin in September, with their jubilees, Lev. xxv. 8–10. And from that beginning of the year, most probably, are the months to be reckoned that are mentioned in the continuance and ending of the flood, Gen. vii. 11, viii. 13. See Josephus, lib. i. cap. iii.

15. For the time of the day wherein the lamb was to be slain, it is designed to be בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, "between the two evenings," of the fourteenth day of the first month. Some of the Jews, as Kimchi, make these two evenings to be the first declining of the sun, which began

the evening or afternoon, and the setting of the sun, which closeth it; answering the ancient division of the day into morning and evening: so that it might be done, by this rule, in any time of the afternoon, though it always followed the evening sacrifice, at the ninth hour, or three of the clock. Others, as Aben Ezra, make the first evening to be the setting of the sun, the other the departure of all light. And the Jews have a distinction of the day, wherein they call this space of it, בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, "between the two evenings," בין השמשות, "between the two suns." So they express themselves in Talmud. Hierus. Berach. cap i.: כל זמן שפני מזרח מאדימין זהו יום הכסיפו זהו בין השמשות: השחירו נעשה העליון דומה לתחתון זהו לילה;—"All the space of time wherein the face of the east is red is called day; when it begins to wax pale, it is called between the suns," (the same with, "between the evenings"); "and when it waxeth black, the upper firmament being like the lower, it is night."

16. The occasion of the institution of this ordinance is so fully and plainly declared in Exodus and Deuteronomy that we shall not need to enlarge upon it. In brief, God being about to accomplish his great work of delivering the people out of Egypt, he thought meet to conjoin together his greatest mercy towards them and his greatest plague upon their enemies. To this end he gives command unto the destroying angel to pass through the land and to slay all the first-born therein, from his who sat upon the throne unto the meanest person belonging unto the body of that nation. And although he might have preserved the Israelites from this destruction by the least intimation of his will unto the instrument used therein, yet, having respect unto the furtherance of their faith and obedience, as also designing their instruction in the way and means of their eternal salvation, he chose to do it by this ordinance of the passover. The form of this service is given us, Exod. xii. 27. It is called פֶּסַח, "pesach;" and the reason of it is subjoined,—for the LORD פָּסַח, "pasach," passed over the houses of Israel. פָּסַח is to pass on by leaping, making as it were a halt in any place, and then leaping over that which is next; whence he that goes halting is called פִּסֵּחַ, "pisseach," one that as it were leaps on from one leg unto the other. Some of the ancients call it "phase," Cheth being only not pronounced. The Greeks retain the name, but corrupt it into πάσχα; and are followed by the Latins, who call it "pascha." Hence, after the apostle had applied this feast and sacrifice unto the Lord Christ, 1 Cor. v. 7, and Christians began to celebrate the commemoration of the passion and suffering of Christ at the time of the year when that was observed, many both of the Greeks and Latins began to think that the word was derived from πάσχω, "patior," to suffer; as both Augustine and Gregory Nazianzen. Serm. de Pasch., do declare, who both of them refute that imagination. The general nature of

it was זֶבַח, "a sacrifice," Exod. xii. 27; and חַג, "a feast," verse 14;—a sacrifice, from the slaying and offering of the lamb, which was done afterwards for the people by the Levites; and a feast, from the joy and remission of labour wherewith the annexed solemnities were to be observed. The matter of it was שֶׂה, "sæh," verse 3; that is, a young lamb or kid, a male without blemish, for either might be used in this service, verse 5. The manner of the service was,—(1.) In the *preparation*, the lamb or kid was to be *taken into custody* on the tenth day of the month, and kept therein four days, verse 6; which, as the Jews say, was partly that they might discern perfectly whether it had any blemish or no, partly that they might by the sight of the lamb be minded of their duty and the mercy of their deliverance. Indeed, it was that it might prefigure the imprisonment of the Lamb of God, Isa. liii. 7, 8, who took away the sins of the world. This [part of the] preparation, the Jews say, was temporary, and observed only at the first institution of the ordinance in Egypt; and that partly lest, in their haste, they should not otherwise have been able to prepare their lambs. So also was the sprinkling of the blood on the posts of the doors of their dwelling-houses with hyssop, Exod. xii. 7; which could not be afterwards observed, when, by God's institution, the whole congregation were to celebrate it in one place. And it had respect unto their present deliverance from the destroying angel, verses 12, 13. In like manner was their eating it, with their loins girt, their shoes on their feet, and their staves in their hands, verse 11, that they might be in a readiness for their immediate departure; which was not afterwards observed by our Lord Jesus Christ nor any of the church, for these signs ceased with the present occasions of them. (2.) This lamb was to be provided for *each household*, verses 3, 4; which was the third distribution of that people, the first being into tribes, and the second into families, from the twelve patriarchs and their immediate sons, Josh. vii. 16–18. But because there was an allowance to make their company proportionable unto their provision of a lamb, joining or separating households, Exod. xii. 4, they ate it afterwards in societies or fraternities, as our Saviour had twelve with him at the eating of it; and the Jews require ten at least in society unto this celebration. Whence the Targum expressly on this place, Exod. xii. 4, "If the men of the house be fewer than the number of ten;" for this was a sacred number with them. They circumcise not, marry not, divorce not, unless ten be present. Thence is their saying in Pirke Aboth, "Where ten sit and learn the law, the divine presence resteth on them," as Ps. lxxxii. 1. (3.) The lamb being provided was to be *killed;* and it was directed that the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel should kill it, Exod. xii. 6,—that is, every one for himself and family. But after the giving of the law and the erection of a priesthood in the church, this work, as it was a sacri-

fice, was left unto the priests, 2 Chron. xxxv. 1–6. (4.) The *place* where it was to be killed was at first in their several houses, or wherever the assembly of the people was; but this afterwards was forbidden, and the sacrifice of the passover confined expressly to the place where the tabernacle and temple were to be, and not elsewhere, Deut. xvi. 5–7. (5.) The preparation of the whole lamb for eating was by *roasting* it, Exod. xii. 8, 9; and that was done with bread unleavened, and bitterness, or bitter herbs, verse 8. And it was all to be eaten that night. What remained until the morning was to be burned in the fire, as a thing dedicated and not to be polluted. The Jews have many traditions about the manner of eating and drinking at this supper, of the cups they drank and blessed, of the cakes they brake, of their washings, and the like: which as they have all of them been discussed by others at large, so I shall not labour about them, as being satisfied that they are most, if not all of them, inventions of the rabbins since the destruction of the second temple; and many of them taken up from what they observed to be in use among Christians, or were led into by such as from the profession of Christianity apostatized unto them,—which were no small multitude.

17. Unto this observation of the passover was adjoined the feast of unleavened bread, which was to begin the next day after the eating of the lamb,—that is, on the fifteenth day of the first month; for whereas the paschal lamb was to be eaten with unleavened bread on the fourteenth, it was a peculiar ceremony of that ordinance, and belonged not unto the ensuing feast, verses 15, 16. And in this feast there are considerable,—(1.) The total exclusion of all *leaven* out of their houses: (2.) The time of its continuance, which was *seven days:* (3.) The double extraordinary *Sabbath* wherewith it was begun and ended; for on the first day and last day of the seven there was to be a solemn and holy convocation unto the Lord, to be observed in a cessation from all labour and in holy duties. And here also it were lost labour to reckon up the cautions, rules, and instructions, which the Jewish doctors give, about the nature, kinds, and sorts of leaven, of the search that was to be made for it, and the like; most of them being vain imaginations of superstitious minds, ignorant of the truth of God.

18. This sacrifice of the passover, with its attendant feast of unleavened bread, to be annually observed, on the fourteenth day of the month Abib unto the end of the twenty-first, was the second solemn ordinance of that people as the people and church of God; and the Jews observe, that no other *positive ordinances*, but only *circumcision* and the *passover*, had that sanction of the כרת, "excision," or extermination, annexed unto them: "Concerning circumcision the words are plain, Gen. xvii. 14, 'The uncircumcised man-child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, וְנִכְרְתָה

הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא,'—'that soul shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant.' And with reference to the passover, Exod. xii. 15, 'Whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.'" Whereas they observe, as Aben Ezra upon this place, that it is annexed to above twenty *negative precepts;* intimating that there is a greater provocation and sin in doing any thing in the worship of God against his commandment than in omitting what he hath commanded, though both of them be evil. The observation, I acknowledge, in general is true, but the application of it to the passover is not so: for although we should suppose that the words of Exod. xii. 15 do relate unto the passover also, although they seem to respect only the seven days of the feast of unleavened bread, yet they do not require the observation of the passover itself under that penalty; but upon a supposition of the observation of the passover, they were to eat the lamb with unleavened bread, which was a negative precept,—namely, that they should have no leaven in their bread,—and so was justly attended in its transgression with this cutting off. And this cutting off the Jews generally interpret, when it is spoken indefinitely, without a prescription of the manner how it should be done, or by whom, to respect יד השמים, "the hand of Heaven," or the vindictive justice of God, which in due time will find out the transgressor; but we know that God long bare with them in the omission of this ordinance of the passover itself.

19. What are the observations of the later Jews, in the imitation of their forefathers' observance of this ordinance of God, the reader may see in Buxtorf's Synagoga Judaica, and in part in the Annotations of Ainsworth, and so they need not here be repeated. This only I shall observe, that all of them, in their expositions of this institution, do make the application of its several parts unto other acts of God in dealing with them; such as, indeed, the text of Moses plainly leads them to. And this perfectly overthrows their pretensions as to their other ceremonies and sacrifices,—namely, that they were instituted for their own sakes, and not as signs of things to come,—the figurative nature of this their greatest ordinance being manifest and acknowledged by themselves.

20. On occasion of this great solemn ordinance, there was given unto the people two additional institutions; the first concerning the *writing* of the law on their foreheads and hands; the other, of the *dedication* unto God of all that opened the matrix. The first of these is prescribed, chap. xiii. 9, "And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the LORD'S law may be in thy mouth." Verse 16, "And it shall be for a token upon thine hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes." Whereunto may be added Deut. vi. 6–9, "And these words, which I command

thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates." In the observation of sundry things supposed to relate unto these precepts consisteth the principal part of the superstition of the present Jews; for they have mixed the observation of this duty, whatever be intended by it, with many foolish and noisome imaginations. It doth not, indeed, appear to me that any more is intended by these expressions, "A sign upon thy hand," and "A memorial" (or "frontlet") "between thine eyes," but a continual remembrance and careful practice of the institution itself, and their calling to mind thereby the mercy and goodness of God in their deliverance; which they were to celebrate, when they came unto a settlement in their own land, by writing some passages of the law upon the door-posts of their houses. But they are otherwise minded. That which is prescribed unto them is called, Exod. xiii. 9, אוֹת, "a sign," as it was to be on their hand; and זִכָּרוֹן, "a memorial," as between their eyes; both which are very capable of our interpretation. But, verse 16, they are called טוֹטָפֹת, as also Deut. vi. 8; from which word, as they know not what it signifies, they draw out all the mysteries of their present observances. The Chaldee renders it תפילין, "thephilin;" which word seems to be taken from the Hebrew תפילה, "prayer," or prayers, and to be so called from the prayers that they used in the consecration and wearing of those frontlets. But because they are rendered in the Greek φυλακτήρια, "phylacteria," some would derive it from תפל, "to conjoin, keep, and bind;" which hath some allusion, at least, to the sense of the Greek word: and this origination and denotation of the word the learned Fuller contends for, Miscellan. lib. v. cap. vii. The manner of their present observation hereof to this purpose is, they write four sections of the law on parchment. And why four? That they gather from the signification of the word טוֹטָפֹת, "totaphoth." "Tot," saith Rabbi Solomon, "in Pontus, by the Caspian Sea somewhere, signifies 'two;' and poth signifies 'two' in Egypt;" both which make four undoubtedly. Or, as they say in the Talmud, "Tat in Casphe signifies 'two;' and pat in Africa." So that four sections must be written. Scaliger supposeth the word to be Egyptian; which is not unlikely. But that it should signify an amulet or a charm, as Petitus supposeth, is not so probable. For to say that such amulets were in use among the heathen, with inscriptions either ridiculous or obscene, which God would not have his people to make use of, and therefore appointed them other things and inscriptions in their stead, which is the only reason produced

for that opinion, doth indeed overthrow it; for it is abundantly evident that God in his laws doth directly, on all occasions, command the contrary to whatever was in practice of this sort among the nations. So that Maimonides well observes, that the reason of many of their institutions cannot be understood without a due consideration of the superstition of the neighbouring nations.

Those four sections must be these that follow. The first is Deut. vi. 4–9, "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD: and thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart:" and so onwards, as before. The second is Exod. xiii. 1–10, "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine. And Moses said unto the people, Remember this day, in which ye came out from Egypt, out of the house of bondage; for by strength of hand the LORD brought you out from this place: there shall no leavened bread be eaten. This day came ye out in the month Abib. And it shall be when the LORD shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the LORD. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters. And thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which the LORD did unto me when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be for a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the LORD'S law may be in thy mouth: for with a strong hand hath the LORD brought thee out of Egypt. Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year to year." The third is from the 11th verse of that chapter unto the end of the 16th: "And it shall be when the LORD shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, as he sware unto thee and to thy fathers, and shall give it thee, that thou shalt set apart unto the LORD all that openeth the matrix, and every firstling that cometh of a beast which thou hast; the males shall be the LORD'S. And every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck: and all the first-born of man among thy children shalt thou redeem. And it shall be when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the LORD brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage: and it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the LORD slew all the first-born in the land of Egypt,

both the first-born of man, and the first-born of beast: therefore I sacrifice to the LORD all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the first-born of my children I redeem. And it shall be for a token upon thine hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes: for by strength of hand the LORD brought us forth out of Egypt." The last is Deut. xi. 13–21: "And it shall come to pass, if ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments, which I command you this day, to love the LORD your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul, that I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full. Take heed to yourselves, that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside, and serve other gods, and worship them; and then the LORD'S wrath be kindled against you, and he shut up the heaven, that there be no rain, and that the land yield not her fruit; and lest ye perish quickly from off the good land which the LORD giveth you. Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thine house, and upon thy gates: that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the LORD sware unto your fathers to give them, as the days of heaven upon the earth."

21. Because in all these places there is mention made of these "frontlets" or "memorials," therefore do they take them out for this use. And these are to be written on *parchment*, made of the skin of a *clean beast*, on the side next the flesh, prepared with a pronunciation of a *form of words*, both in the killing of the beast, and in the delivery of the skin unto the dresser and to the writer. When they are written, they are wrapped up in small rolls, and so worn upon their foreheads and left arms, being so rolled and made up that none of the writing might be seen. And great art is required in the making of these tephilin, which few amongst them attain unto. Hence Fagius tells us a story of a master amongst them in his days, who sold many thousands of these phylacteries unto his countrymen, which had nothing in them but cards; which served their turns well enough. Their masters, also, are curious in describing what part of the head they must be applied unto,—namely, the fore part from ear to ear; and the hand must be the left hand, whereby yet they will have the arm above the elbow to be understood; and when they must be worn, namely, by day, not by night, on the week days, not on the Sabbath, and the like worthy speculations. The benefit also

they receive hereby is incredible; for by them are they *defended from evil*,—as some by the sign of the cross, others by the first words of the Gospel of John worn about them. They are sanctified in the law; and, in a word, the Targum on the Canticles, chap. viii. 3, tells us that "God chose them above all people, because they wore the phylacteries"! So just cause had our Lord Jesus Christ to reprove their hypocrisy, superstition, and self-justification, in the use, abuse, and boasting of these things: Matt. xxiii. 5, "All their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments." This about the "borders of their garments" was an after-institution; yet, because of its answerableness unto this, we may add it in this place. To this purpose God gives his command, Num. xv. 38–40, "Speak unto the children of Israel, and bid them that they make them fringes in the borders of their garments throughout their generations, and that they put upon the fringe of the borders a riband of blue: and it shall be unto you for a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the LORD, and do them; and that ye seek not after your own heart and your own eyes, after which ye use to go a whoring: that ye may remember, and do all my commandments, and be holy unto your God;" which law is repeated again, Deut. xxii. 12, "Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four quarters of thy vesture, wherewith thou coverest thyself." These צִיצִית, "locks," or "fringes," made of thread fastened unto the wings or skirts of their garments with a riband, תְּכֵלֶת, of a blue colour (which how to make at present the Jews confess they know not, but suppose it was made with the blood of a fish called chalazon, mixed with vermilion), had virtue and efficacy from the institution of God, who alone is able to bless and sanctify things in themselves indifferent unto a sacred use, to the keeping of their hearts in a due reverence unto himself, and their eyes from wandering after false worship and superstition; which being now removed and taken away, the things themselves are, among the present Jews, turned into the greatest superstition imaginable. Their principal vanities about these things, having been represented by others out of Maimonides his treatise on that subject, need not here be repeated.

22. The last appointment of God, occasioned by the mercy solemnly remembered in the passover, was the *dedication* of all the first-born males unto himself. The law of this dedication is recorded Exod. xiii. 12, 13; and the manner of its performance is further added Num. xviii. 15–17, "Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto the LORD, whether it be of men or beasts, shall be thine: nevertheless the first-born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem. And those that are to be redeemed from a month old

shalt thou redeem, according to thine estimation, for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs. But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy: thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto the LORD." The whole dedication of the first-born males is distributed into three parts:—(1.) *Children*, who were to be redeemed with five shekels, twenty gerahs to one shekel; that is, about twelve shillings of our money. (2.) *Clean beasts*, such as were appointed to be offered in sacrifice on other occasions, as the kine, the sheep, and the goats. These were to be offered unto God in a sacrifice of burnt-offering, without redemption or commutation, after they had been kept a month with the dam. (3.) *Unclean beasts*, whereof an instance is given in the ass; which were either to be redeemed with money by an agreement with the priest, or to have their necks broken, at the choice of the owner. And all this to call to remembrance the mercy of God in sparing them and theirs when the first-born of man and beast, clean and unclean, in Egypt were destroyed: for hence a peculiar right of especial preservation arose unto God towards all their *first-born;* and this also not without a prospect towards the redemption of the "church of the first-born" by Jesus Christ, Heb. xii. 23.

23. And this gave a period to the first dispensation of God towards the church in the posterity of Abraham, [which had lasted] for the space of four hundred and thirty years. With the provision and furniture of these ordinances of worship they left Egypt, and, passing through the Red Sea, came into the wilderness of Sinai, where they received the law, and were made perfect in the beauty of typical holiness and worship.

24. Unto these ordinances succeeded the solemn νομοθεσία, or giving of the law on Mount Sinai, with the precepts and sanctions thereof, mentioned in several places by our apostle; as chap. ii. 2, "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." Chap. x. 28, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses." Chap. xii. 18–21, "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more: for they could not endure that which was commanded, And if so much as a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: and so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake." Verse 25, "They escaped not who refused him that spake on earth." And in other places.

25. Three things must be explained in reference unto this great and solemn foundation of that Judaical church-state, which our apostle treateth about in this whole epistle;—first, The *preparations* for it; secondly, The *manner* of the giving of it; thirdly, The *law* itself. For the preparations for it, they are either more remote or immediately preceding it. The former were those temporary, occasional, instructive ordinances, which God gave them at their entrance into the wilderness, before they came to receive the law on Sinai.

The first mentioned of this nature is Exod. xv. 23–26, "And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they were bitter: therefore the name of it was called Marah. And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink? And he cried unto the LORD; and the LORD showed him a tree, which when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet: there he made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there he proved them, and said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the LORD that healeth thee." The whole course of God's proceeding with his people, whereof we have here the first pledge in the wilderness, was by a constant series of temporal providential straits, sinful murmurings, and typical mercies.

The waters being so bitter that they could not drink of them, God showed to Moses a tree; that is, say some of the Jewish doctors, he showed him the virtue of a tree to cure and make wholesome bitter waters. And they say it was a tree whose flowers and fruit were bitter; for no other reason but because Elisha afterwards cured salt waters by casting into them a cruse of salt. The Targum of Jonathan and that of Jerusalem say, God showed him אילן מריר דארדפני, "the bitter tree Ardiphne;" which is nothing but Δάφνη, "Daphne," the laurel. And on this tree the author of that fabulous paraphrase would have the glorious name of God to be written, according to the incantations in use amongst them in his days. But that which is designed in the whole is, that God, preparing them for the bitter, consuming law that was to be given them, and discovering unto them their disability to drink of the waters of it for their refreshment, gave them an intimation of the cure of that curse and bitterness, by Him who "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," 1 Pet. ii. 24; who is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," Rom. x. 4.

26. Their second preparation for the receiving of the law, was the giving of *manna* unto them from heaven. Being come into the wilderness of Sin, between Elim and Sinai (called so from a city in

Egypt that it extended unto), in the midst of the second month after their departure from Egypt, the stores they brought with them from thence being spent and exhausted, the whole congregation murmured for food; as still their wants and murmurings lay at the bottom, and were the occasion of those reliefs whereby the spiritual mercies of the church by Christ were typed out. In this condition God sends them manna: Exod. xvi. 13–15, "In the morning the dew lay round about the host. And when the dew that lay was gone up, behold, upon the face of the wilderness there lay a small round thing, as small as the hoar frost on the ground. And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another, It is manna: for they wist not what it was. And Moses said unto them, This is the bread which the LORD hath given you to eat." Verse 31, "And the house of Israel called the name thereof Manna: and it was like coriander seed, white; and the taste of it was like wafers made with honey."

"When the children of Israel saw it, they said מָן הוּא,"—"Man hu;" and, verse 31, "The house of Israel called the name thereof מָן,"—"Man." The reason of this name is very uncertain. The calling of it manna in the New Testament, gives countenance to the derivation of the word from מָנָה, "manah," to "prepare and distribute." For what some have thought, that it should be an abbreviation of מַתָּנָה, "a gift," and spoken by them in their precipitate haste, is destitute of all probability. If it be from מָנָה, "manah," it signifies a "prepared meat" or "portion." So upon the sight of it they said, one to another, "Here is a portion prepared." But the truth is, the following words, wherein there is a reason given why they said, upon the sight of it, מָן הוּא, "Man hu," inclines strongly to another signification: כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ מַה־הוּא;—"For they knew not ma hu," "what it was." "They said one to another, Man hu, because they knew not ma hu,"—that is, "what it was." So that "Man hu" is as much as, "What is it?" and so the words are rendered by the LXX., Τί ἐστι τοῦτο;—"What is this?" and by the Vulgar Latin, "Quid est hoc?" But this difficulty remains, that מָן, "man," is not in the Hebrew tongue an interrogative of the thing, no, nor yet of the person, nor doth signify "what." Aben Ezra says it is an Arabic word; Chiskuni, an Egyptian; and it is evidently an interrogative of the person in the Chaldee, and sometimes of the thing; as Judges xiii. 17, מִי שְׁמֶךָ,—"What is thy name?" Yea, it seems to be used towards this sense in the Hebrew, Ps. lxi. 8, חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת מַן יְנַצְּרֵהוּ; where, though most take מָן, "man," to be the imperative in Pihel from מָנָה, "manah," which nowhere else occurs, yet the LXX. took it to be an interrogation from the Chaldee, rendering the words, Τίς ἐκζητήσει;—"Who shall find out?" Being, therefore, the language of the common people, in their admiration of a thing new unto them, that is expressed, it is no

wonder that they made use of a word that had obtained amongst them from some of the nations with whom they had been conversant, differing little in sound from that of their own of the same signification, and afterwards admitted into common use amongst them. From this occasional interrogation did the food provided for them take its name of "man," called in the New Testament "manna:" such occasional imposition of names to persons and things being at all times frequent and usual; as in the chapter foregoing, the place was called Marah, from the bitterness of the water, that they cried out of upon their first tasting it; and in the next, Massah and Meribah, from their temptations and provocations. That which alone we have to observe concerning this dispensation of God towards them is, that they had this eminent renewed pledge of the bread of life, the food of their souls, the Lord Christ, given unto them before they were intrusted with the law; which by making their only glory, and betaking themselves unto, without the healing tree and heavenly manna, is become their snare and ruin. See John vi. 31, 32, 48, 49, 51; Rev. ii. 17.

27. A third signal preparation for the law, on the like occasion, and to the same purpose with the former, is repeated Exod. xvii. 1–7: "And all the congregation of the children of Israel journeyed from the wilderness of Sin, after their journeys, according to the commandment of the LORD, and pitched in Rephidim: and there was no water for the people to drink. Wherefore the people did chide with Moses, and said, Give us water that we may drink. And Moses said unto them, Why chide ye with me? wherefore do ye tempt the LORD? And the people thirsted there for water; and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto the LORD, saying, What shall I do unto this people? they be almost ready to stone me. And the LORD said unto Moses, Go on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel; and thy rod, wherewith thou smotest the river, take in thine hand, and go. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel. And he called the name of the place Massah, and Meribah, because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the LORD, saying, Is the LORD among us, or not?" Marching up farther into the wilderness, and coming to Rephidim, their fourth station from the Red Sea, meeting with no waters to their satisfaction, they fell into a high murmuring against the Lord, and mutiny against Moses their leader. And this iniquity, the Jewish doctors suppose, was aggravated, because they were in no absolute necessity for water,

the dew which fell from the manna running in some streams. Hereon God leads Moses to the rock of Horeb, where himself appeared in the cloud which he had prepared for the place of giving the law, commanding him to take his rod in his hand to smite the rock; whereon waters flowed out for the relief of this sinful, murmuring people. And the Holy Ghost hath put sundry marks upon this dispensation of God towards them:—

First upon the sin of the people, whence he gave a double name to the place where they sinned, for a memorial to all generations. He called it Massah and Meribah; which words our apostle renders by πειρασμός and παραπικρασμός, Heb. iii. 8,—"temptation" and "provoking contention." And it is often mentioned again, both on the part of the people, either to reproach and burden them with their sin, as Deut. ix. 22, "And at Massah ye provoked the LORD to wrath;" or to warn them of the like miscarriage, chap. vi. 16, "Ye shall not tempt the LORD your God, as ye tempted him in Massah;" as also Ps. xcv. 8;—and on the part of Moses, as to the signal trial that God had there of his faith and obedience, in that great difficulty which he conflicted withal; as also of those of the tribe of Levi, who, in a preparation unto their ensuing dedication unto God, clave unto him in his straits, Deut. xxxiii. 8, "And of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy One, whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah." The mercy likewise that ensued, in giving them water from the rock, is most frequently celebrated, Deut. viii. 15; Ps. lxxviii. 15, 16, cv. 41; Neh. ix. 15.

Now, all this was done to bring them to attend and inquire diligently into the kernel, the pearl of this mercy, whose outward shell was so undeservedly free and so deservedly precious: for in this rock of Horeb lay hid a "spiritual Rock," as our apostle tells us, 1 Cor. x. 4, even Christ, the Son of God; who, being smitten with the rod of Moses, or the stroke and curse of the law administered by him, gave out waters of life freely unto all that thirst and come unto him.

28. Thus did God prepare this people for the receiving of the law, by a triple intimation of him who is the Redeemer from the law, and by whom alone the law that was to be given could be made useful and profitable unto them. And all these intimations were still given them on their great and signal provocations; to declare that neither did their goodness deserve them, nor could their sins hinder the progress of the counsel of God's will and the work of his grace. Hereby, also, did God revive unto them the grace of the promise; which being given, as our apostle observes, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law, could not be disannulled or impeached thereby.

And these I call the *remote preparations* of the people for the

receiving of the law, consisting in three revelations of the grace of God in Christ, happening and granted unto them in the three months' space which they spent between the Red Sea and their coming unto the wilderness of Sinai, or to the mountain where they received the law.

29. The *immediate preparations* for giving of the law are all of them expressed Exod. xix.; and these we shall briefly pass through, the most of them being insisted on or referred unto by our apostle in the places before mentioned.

First, The time of the people's coming unto the place where they were to receive the law is related verse 1. It was בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁלִישִׁי, "novilunio tertio," in the third month after their coming up out of Egypt; that is, on the first day of the month, the month Sivan, on the day of the new moon. And therefore it is added, בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה, "on the same day." On which Aben Ezra observes, "Moses went up first into the mountain to receive the commands of God, and returning on that day to the people, he went up again on the third day, that is, the third day of the month, to give in their answer unto the Lord," verses 11, 16. And this fell out, if not on the day, yet about the time of Pentecost, whereon afterwards the Holy Ghost descended on the apostles, enabling them to preach the gospel, and therein our deliverance from the curse of the law given at that time.

30. For the special *time of the day* when God began to give out the appearances of his glory, it is said, verse 16, בִּהְיֹת הַבֹּקֶר, "Whilst it was yet morning." And Jarchi observes that all Moses' ascents into the mountain were בהשכמה, "early in the morning;" which he proves from chap. xxiv. 4, "And Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto Mount Sinai." And בֹּקֶר, "boker," properly signifies "the first appearance of the morning," the light that must be inquired and sought after before the rising of the sun. So David, Ps. cxxx. 6, compares the earnest expectation of his soul for mercy unto the diligent watching of men for the morning; that is, the first appearance of light. And this was the season wherein our blessed Saviour rose from the grave and from under the curse of the law, bringing with him the tidings of peace with God and deliverance. He rose between the first dawning of light and the rising of the sun, Matt. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 2; unto that latitude of time doth the Scripture assign it, and the first evidence of it. For whereas John says that Mary Magdalene came to the sepulchre very early, "when it was yet dark," chap. xx. 1; Matthew, "when it began to dawn toward day," chap. xxviii. 1; Mark, "very early in the morning, at the rising of the sun," chap. xvi. 2, who compriseth the utmost abode of the women at the sepulchre; Luke expresses it indefinitely, ὄρθρου βαθέος, "profundo mane," chap. xxiv. 1, that is, בַּבֹּקֶר, "in the first

appearance and dawning of light;"—at which time the preparation for the promulgation of the law began.

31. The place they came unto is called "The wilderness of Sinai," Exod. xix. 2; and so was the mountain also itself whereon the glorious majesty of God appeared, verse 20. It was also called "Horeb:" chap. iii. 1, "He came to the mountain of God, even to Horeb," where they were to "serve God," verse 12; and it was on this account afterwards called "Horeb the mount of God," 1 Kings xix. 8. And the whole wilderness was termed "The wilderness of Horeb," Deut. i. It is therefore generally supposed that they were several names of the same places, the mountain and wilderness wherein it was being both called Sinai and Horeb. And they were both occasional names, taken from the nature of the place, סִינַי, "Sinai," from סְנֶה, "Seneh," "A bush," such as the angel appeared unto Moses in, Exod. iii. 2, such whereof a multitude were in that place; and "Horeb" from its drought and barrenness, which is the signification of the word. But the opinion of Moses Gerundensis is far more probable, that Horeb was the name of the wilderness, and Sinai of the mountain. That Sinai was the name of the hill is expressly affirmed, chap. xix. 18, 20, "And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire. And the LORD came down upon mount Sinai, on the top of the mount." So Ps. lxviii. 17. And whereas mention is made of the "wilderness of Sinai," it is no more but the wilderness wherein mount Sinai was. And for those places before referred to, where Horeb seems to be called "The mount of God," the words in them all will bear to be read, "To the mount of God in Horeb." Strabo calls this very mount Σινᾶν, lib. xvi.; and Justin says of Moses, "Montem Sinan occupat." The people, therefore, abode in Horeb, at the foot of the mountain, or about it; and the law was promulgated on the top of Sinai, in the most desert solitude of that wilderness. And in this place hath the superstition of some Christians in later ages built a monastery, for the celebration of their devotion by an order of monks, whose archimandrite was not many years since in England. But as the place, materially considered, is as evident an object of God's displeasure against the lower part of the creation, upon the account of sin, as almost any place in the world, a waste and howling wilderness, a place left to solitude and barrenness, so in its allusion or relation to the worship of God, it is cast by our apostle under "bondage," and placed in an opposition to the worship and church-state of the gospel, Gal. iv. 24, 25.

32. Being come unto this place, it is said, "Moses went up into the mount unto God." It doth not appear that he had any new immediate express command so to do; probably he both came to that place, and so soon as he came thither went up into the moun-

tain, in obedience to the command and in faith on the promise of God which he received upon his first call, Exod. iii. 12; wherein it was given him for a token and pledge of their deliverance, that thereon they should worship God, and receive the law in that mountain: which is also the judgment of Aben Ezra upon the place. And it is not unlikely but that God at that time fixed the cloud which went before them, as the token of his presence, on the top of Sinai, as a new direction unto Moses for his going up thither.

33. Being ascended, God calls unto him ("The Word of the Lord," saith Jonathan), and teacheth him to prepare the people for the receiving of the law, chap. xix. 3–6. Two things he proposeth to their consideration;—first, The *benefits* that they had already been made partakers of, hinted out unto them by the mighty and wonderful works of his power; and, secondly, *New privileges* to be granted unto them.

In the first he reminds them that he had "borne them on eagles' wings." This Jarchi interprets of their sudden gathering out of all the coasts of Goshen unto Rameses, to go away together the same night, chap. xii. 37. But although it may be allowed that they had, in that wonderful collection of themselves, some especial *assistance* of Providence besides the preparation which they had been making for sundry days before, yet this expression evidently extends itself unto the whole dispensation of God towards them, from the first of their deliverance unto that day. Generally, they all of them explain this allegorical expression from the manner the eagles, as they say, carry their young; which is on their backs or wings, because they fear nothing above them, as soaring over all, whereas other fowls carry their young between their feet, as fearing other birds of prey above them. But there is no need to wring the expression, to force out of it such uncertain niceties. There is no more intended but that God carried them speedily and safely, as an eagle is borne by its wings in its course.

To this remembrance of former mercies God adds, secondly, *a treble promise;*—first, That they should be סְגֻלָּה, "segullah;" a word that hath none to declare it by. We render it here and elsewhere "A peculiar treasure," Eccles. ii. 8. It is rendered by our apostle, Tit. ii. 14, Λαὸς περιούσιος, "A peculiar people;" and by another, Λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, 1 Pet. ii. 9, which we translate in like manner. Secondly, That they should be מַמְלֶכֶת כֹּהֲנִים, "A kingdom of priests;" that is, שרים, "of princes," saith Jarchi, as David's sons, who were princes, are said to be כהנים. And it is not denied but that the word is sometimes so used; but whereas here it intendeth the special separation and dedication of the people unto God after the manner of priests, thence the allusion is taken, the dignity of princes being included in that of "a kingdom." And this Peter renders Βασί-

λειον ἱεράτευμα, "A kingly priesthood." And in the translation of this privilege over unto believers under the gospel, it is said that by Christ they are made "kings and priests unto God," Rev. i. 6. It is added, that they should be "an holy nation," as expressly 1 Pet. ii. 9.

34. That which God, on the other hand, requires of them is, that they keep his covenant, Exod. xix. 5. Now, this covenant of God with them had a double expression,—first, In the giving of it unto Abraham, and its confirmation by the sign of circumcision. But this is not that which is here especially intended; for it was the administration of the covenant, wherein the whole people became the peculiar treasure and inheritance of God upon a new account, which is respected. Now, this covenant was not yet made, nor was it ratified until the dedication of the altar by the sprinkling of it with the blood of the covenant; as Aben Ezra well observes, and as our apostle manifests at large, Heb. ix. 19–21. Wherefore the people, taking upon themselves the performance of it, and all the statutes and laws thereof, of which yet they knew not what they were, did give up themselves unto the sovereignty and wisdom of God; which is the indispensable duty of all that will enter into covenant with him.

35. For the further preparation of the people, God appoints that they should be "sanctified," and should "wash their clothes," Exod. xix. 10, which was done accordingly, verse 14. The first contained their moral, the latter their ceremonial significative preparation, for converse with God. The former consisted in the due disposal of their minds unto that godly fear and holy reverence that becomes poor worms of the earth, unto whom the glorious God makes such approaches as he did unto them. The latter denoted that purity and holiness which was required in their inward man. From this latter *temporary, occasional* institution, such as they had many granted to them whilst they were in the wilderness before the giving of the law, the rabbins have framed a baptism for those that enter into their synagogue;—a fancy too greedily embraced by some Christian writers, who would have the holy ordinance of the church's baptism to be derived from thence. But this washing of their clothes (not of their bodies) was temporary, never repeated, neither is there any thing of any such baptism or washing required in any proselytes, either men or women, where the laws of their admission are strictly set down; nor are there the least footsteps of any such usage amongst the Jews until after the days of John Baptist; in imitation of whom it was first taken up by some ante-Mishnical rabbins.

36. The next thing which Moses did, by the command of God, after he returned from the mount, was to set bounds unto it and the people, that none of them might press to go up until the trumpet had done its long and last sounding,—a sign of the departure of the

presence of God: Verses 12, 13, "And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: there shall not an hand touch it, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man, it shall not live: when the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount." The law, the sanction, and the duration of the obedience required, are here represented. The law expresseth an evil prohibited, both in itself and in the end of it. The evil itself, was going up into, or so much as touching by any means, the mountain or the border of it. The end wherefore this was prohibited was, that they might not gaze: Verse 21, "Charge the people, lest they break through unto the LORD to gaze." The sanction is death, enjoined from the hand of men in these verses; and threatened from the hand of Heaven, verses 21, 24. The continuance of the observance was until the trumpet sounded long, or had done sounding; the sign of the departure of God's special presence, which made the place holy only during its continuance.

37. For the law, it is said expressly that the mount was not to be touched; it might not be touched by man or beast. Yet our apostle, treating concerning it, calls it "The mount that might be touched," Heb. xii. 18. For although *de jure*, whilst that temporary command continued in force, it might not be touched,—which seemed to render it glorious,—yet, saith the apostle, it was but a *carnal thing*, that might *de facto* be touched by man or beast, had they not been severely prohibited; and so is no way to be compared with that heavenly "mount Sion" which we are called unto in the worship of God under the gospel.

38. The contexture of the words in our translation seems to have some difficulty: Exod. xix. 12, "Whosoever toucheth the mount." Verse 13, "There shall not an hand touch it,"—לֹא־תִגַּע בּוֹ יָד. It should seem that by "it," בּוֹ, the mount itself is intended, and that the law is re-enforced in a particular caution, that so much as an hand should not touch the mount. But it is far more probable that by "it," "touch it," the person, man or beast, that touched the mountain is intended; and that the words declare the manner how the offender should be destroyed. Being made anathema, devoted, accursed, by his presumptuous sin, no man was to touch him, or to lay hand on him to deliver him, lest he also contracted of his guilt. And this sense the ensuing words, with the series of them, evinceth: סָקוֹל יִסָּקֵל אוֹ־יָרֹה יִיָּרֶה אִם־בְּהֵמָה אִם־אִישׁ לֹא יִחְיֶה; that is, "No hand shall touch it," either to save it or to punish it, "but stoning it shall be stoned, or thrusting through it shall be thrust through; whether man or beast, it shall not live;"—'Let none think, by laying hand on it, to deliver

it.' Whence Aquila renders יָרֹה יִיָּרֶה by ποιζήσει: 'He shall be slain or destroyed *cum impetu et horrore*, with force and terror; all being to cast stones at him, or to shoot him through with arrows, or thrust him through with darts." So Aben Ezra: הטעם לא יכנס אדם לתפשו רק יסקלוהו הרואי ממקום מעמדם ואם רחיק יורוהו בחצים;—"The meaning is, 'Men shall not gather about him to take him; but those that see him shall stone him from the place of their station. And if he be afar off, they shall shoot him through with arrows.'"

39. Touching the mountain, or the border, limit, or bound set unto it by God's appointment, was the sin forbidden. And the end of it, as was said, was, that they should not break through לִרְאוֹת, "to see;" "to gaze," say we, properly; to look with curiosity on the appearances of God's glory,—for which cause he smote the men of Beth-shemesh upon their looking into the ark, 1 Sam. vi. 19: God intending by this prohibition to beget in the people an awe and reverence of his holy majesty, as the great Lawgiver; and by the terror thereof to bring them and their posterity into that bondage frame of spirit, that servile awe, that was to abide upon them until such time as He came who was to give liberty and boldness to his church, by dispensing unto believers the Spirit of adoption, enabling them to cry, "Abba, Father," and to enter with boldness into the holy place, even to the throne of grace.

40. In case the punishment appointed were neglected by the people, God threatens to see to the execution of it himself: Exod. xix. 21, "Lest they break through unto the LORD to gaze, and many of them perish." Verse 24, "But let not the priests and the people break through to come up unto the LORD, lest he break forth upon them." For to make them watchful in their duty, he lets them know that their miscarriage in this matter, devolving the punishment of the transgressor by their neglect upon him, should be imputed by him unto the whole people; so that he would in such a case break forth upon them with his judgments, and many of them should be consumed, to the terror and warning of the remnant.

The continuance of this prescription was from the day before the appearance of the glory of God on the mount, until by the long sounding of the trumpet they perceived the presence of God had left the place: Verse 13, "When the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount;" that is, they had liberty so to do.

41. Things thus prepared, the people were brought forth unto their station, to attend unto the law: Verse 17, "And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount." This station of the people in mount Sinai is, amongst the Jews, the most celebrious thing that ever befell them, and many disputes they have about their order therein. Some few things we may observe from it.

Moses brought forth the people לִקְרַאת הָאֱלֹהִים, "in occursum ipsius Dei," to meet with God himself. לקמוה למימרא דיי,—"To meet with" (or "before") "the Word of God," saith Onkelos. שכינתא דיי, saith Ben Uzziel,—"The glorious presence of God." Ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ·—"The essential Word of God, the brightness of his glory," the Son of God, the head and lawgiver of the church in all ages.

42. "And they stood at the nether part of the mount." Verse 2, it is said, וַיִּחַן־שָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל נֶגֶד הָהָר;—"And Israel encamped there before the mount," in the singular number; that is, "in such order," saith Jarchi, "that they were all as one man." And saith he, "They were on the east side of the mountain, where also they kept their station at the giving of the law;" for so he would have the word נֶגֶד to denote, though he gives no instance to confirm his opinion. But Aben Ezra expressly rejects this fancy, and that by a notable instance, where it is said, "The people pitched their tents נֶגֶד," "before the tabernacle of the congregation round about." So that although they were round about the tabernacle, they are said to be before it, because of the special regard which they had unto it. And at this station in the wilderness command was given to "set bounds unto the people סָבִיב," "round about," verse 12; which there had been no need of had not the people been gathered round about the mountain.

43. Now, they generally agree that this was the order wherein they stood:—First stood the priests, mentioned expressly verse 22, and said there to "come near to the LORD;" that is, nearer than the rest of the people, though they also are expressly forbidden to come so nigh as to touch the mount, verse 24. These priests were as yet the first-born, before a commutation was made, and the tribe of Levi accepted in their room. Next to the priests stood the princes or heads of the tribes, attended with the elders and officers of the people. The body of the people, or the "men of Israel," as they speak, stood next to them, and behind them the women and children; the remotest of all in this order being, as they suppose, the proselytes that adhered unto them. Thus Aben Ezra expressly: כי בתחלה היו בכורי הנגשים אל יי;—"First were the first-born, who drew nigh to God;" ואחריהם ראשי שבטים הם הנשיאים,—"and after them were the heads of the tribes," that is, the princes; ואחריהם חזקנים,—"after them the elders;" ואחריהם השוטרים,—"after them the officers;" ואחריהם כל איש ישראל,—"after them all the men of Israel;" ואחריהם הטף,—"after them the children," that is, males; ואחריהם הנשים,—"after them the women;" ואחריהם הגרים,—"after them the proselytes" or "strangers."

44. All things being thus disposed, in the morning of the third day the appearances of God's glorious presence began to be manifested: Verse 16, "And it came to pass on the third day in the

morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled." Verse 18, "And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the LORD descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." That all these things were the effects of the ministry of angels, preparing the place of God's glorious presence, and attending upon him in their work, the Scripture elsewhere testifies, and we have before manifested; so that there is no need here further to insist upon it.

45. Upon this preparation for the descent of the glory of God, upon the sight of his harbingers and evidence of his coming, Moses brought forth the people לִקְרַאת הָאֱלֹהִים,—"to meet with God." He brought them out of the camp, which was at some farther distance, unto the bounds that by God's prescription he had set unto mount Sinai. And Rashi on the place observes, not unfitly, that this going of the people to meet with God argues that the glory of God came also to meet with them, as the bridegroom goeth out to meet the bride; for it was a marriage covenant that God then took the people into, whence it is said that "the LORD came from Sinai," namely, to meet the people, Deut. xxxiii. 2.

46. The utmost of the approach of the people was to "the nether part of the mount." The Targum of Jerusalem hath a foolish imagination from this expression, which they have also in the Talmud, —namely, that mount Sinai was plucked up by the roots, and lifted up into the air, so that the people stood under it: which Jarchi calls a "midrash;" that is, though not in the signification of the word, yet in the usual application of it, an allegorical fable.

In this posture the people trembled, and were not able to keep their station, but removed from their place, Exod. xx. 18. "And the whole mount quaked greatly," chap. xix. 18; so terrible was the appearance of the majesty of God in giving out his "fiery law."

In this general consternation of all, it is added that Moses himself spake, verse 19, "and God answered him by a voice." What he spake is not declared, nor was there any occasion for his speaking, nor can any account be given why he should speak to God, when God was solemnly preparing to speak to him and the people; nor is it said that he spake to God, but only that he spake. And it is signally added that God answered him בְּקוֹל, "in" (or "by") "a voice." For my part, I doubt not but that in this general consternation that befell all the people, Moses himself, being surprised with fear, spake the words recorded by our apostle, Heb. xii. 21, "I exceedingly fear and quake;" which condition he was relieved from by the comforting voice of God, and so confirmed unto the remainder of his ministry.

These brief remarks being given upon the preparation for and the manner of the giving of the law, we shall summarily consider the general nature of the law and its sanctions in our next Exercitations.

EXERCITATION XX.

THE LAW AND PRECEPTS THEREOF.

1. What meant by the "law" among the Jews. 2. The common distribution of it into moral, ceremonial, and judicial—The ground of that distribution. 3. This distinction not insisted on by the Jews—Six hundred and thirteen precepts collected by them. 4. Reasons of that number—Of these, two hundred and forty-eight affirmative, three hundred and sixty-five negative. 5. Twelve houses of each sort. 6. First house of affirmatives, concerning God and his worship, in twenty precepts. 7. The second, concerning the temple and priesthood, in number nineteen. 8. The third, concerning sacrifices, in fifty-seven precepts. 9. The fourth, of cleanness and uncleanness, eighteen. 10. The fifth, of alms and tithes, in thirty-two precepts. 11. The sixth, about things to be eaten, in seven commands. 12. The seventh, concerning the passover and other festivals, twenty. 13. The eighth, of rule and judgment, in thirteen precepts. 14. The ninth, of doctrine and truth, whose commands are twenty-five. 15. The tenth, concerning women and matrimony, in twelve precepts. 16. The eleventh, of criminal judgments and punishments, in eight precepts. 17. The twelfth, of civil judgments, in seventeen precepts. 18. Censure of this collection. 19. Negative precepts, in twelve families. 20. The first family, of false worship, in forty-seven prohibitions. 21. Remarks. 22. The second family, of separation from the heathen. 23. The third family, of things sacred. 24. The fourth family, of sacrifices and priests. 25. The fifth family, of meats. 26. The sixth family, of fields and harvest. 27. The seventh family, the house of doctrines. 28. The eighth family, of justice and judgment. 29. The ninth family, of feasts. 30. The tenth family, of chastity. 31. The eleventh family, of marriages. 32. The twelfth family, of the manner of the kingdom. 33–35. Concluding remarks.

1. THE law itself and its sanctions are the next thing that our apostle makes mention of in the economy of the Judaical church. By this law he especially understands the law given on mount Sinai, or partly there, partly from the tabernacle, the type of Christ, after it was erected. The Jews by the תורה, or "law," generally understand the whole five books of Moses, as they are also called in the New Testament; and all precepts that they can gather out of them anywhere they refer to the law: wherein they are not to be contended withal.

2. This whole law is generally distributed into three parts;—first, the *moral;* secondly, the *ceremonial;* thirdly, the *judicial* part of it. And, indeed, there is no precept but may conveniently be referred unto one or other of these heads, as they are usually explained. That which is commonly called the *moral law,* the Scripture terms, דִּבְרֵי הַבְּרִית עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים, Exod. xxxiv. 28, "The words of the covenant,

the ten words," from whence is the Greek δεκάλογος, or the law of ten words or precepts; all which in their substance are moral, and universally obligatory to all the sons of men. That part of the law which the Scripture calls מִשְׁפָּטִים, "judgments," Exod. xxi. 1, determining of rights between man and man, and of punishments upon transgressors, with especial reference unto the interest of the people in the land of Canaan, is by us usually termed the *judicial law;* and the institutions of ceremonial worship are most commonly expressed by the name of חקים, the whole system whereof is termed the *law ceremonial.*

3. The Jews either acknowledge not or insist not much on this distinction, which is evidently founded in the things themselves, but, casting all these parts of the law together, contend that there is amongst them six hundred and thirteen precepts: for the numeral letters of תורה denote six hundred and eleven of them; and the other two,—which, as they say, are the first two of the decalogue,—were delivered by God himself to the people, and so come not within the compass of the word Torah in that place: whence they take this important consideration, namely, Deut. xxxiii. 4, "Moses commanded us a law," that is, of six hundred and eleven precepts; two being given by God himself, completes the number of six hundred and thirteen. There is none who sees not the vanity and folly of these things; which yet is a part of their *oral law,* whereunto, as hath been showed, they ascribe more, oftentimes, than to the written word itself.

4. Of these six hundred and thirteen precepts, two hundred and forty-eight, they say, are *affirmative* precepts; because there are, as they affirm (which I leave to our anatomists to judge of), so many distinct members or bones in the body of a man: and three hundred and sixty-five *negative* precepts; because there are so many days in the year, man being bound to keep the law *with his whole body all the year long:* both which numbers make up six hundred and thirteen. And lest this observation should not seem sufficiently strengthened by these arguments, they add that which they suppose conclusive,—namely, that in the decalogue there are six hundred and thirteen letters, if you will but set aside the last two words; which in common civility cannot be well denied unto them.

5. These six hundred and thirteen precepts they divide or distinguish into twelve families, according to the number of the tribes of Israel,—that is, either general part into twelve,—first the *affirmative,* and secondly the *negative.* And although their distribution be not satisfactory, for many reasons, and hath been also represented by others, yet, for the advantage of the reader, I shall here give a summary account of them.

6. The first family, which hath relation to GOD AND HIS WORSHIP, consists of twenty precepts, which I shall briefly enumerate as those

following, without any examination of their stating of them and due fixing to their several stations:—1. *Faith and acknowledgment of God's divine essence and existence*, Exod. xx. 2, 3. 2. Faith of the *unity* of God, Deut. vi. 4, xxxii. 39. 3. *Love* of God, Deut. vi. 5, x. 12. 4. *Fear* of God, Deut. vi. 13. 5. *Acknowledgment* of God's righteousness in afflictions, Deut. viii. 5. 6. *Prayer* unto God, Exod. xxii. 23; Num. xi. 2. 7. *Adherence* unto God, Deut. x. 20. 8. To *swear* by the name of God, Deut. vi. 13, x. 20. 9. To *walk* in the ways of God, Deut. xxviii. 9. 10. To *sanctify* the name of God, Lev. xxii. 32. 11. Twice a day to repeat that section, "Hear, O Israel," Deut. vi. 4, xi. 13. 12. That we *learn* and *teach* the law, Deut. v. 1, xi. 8. 13. To wear *phylacteries* or *tephilin* on the *head*, Deut. vi. 8. 14. To wear them on the *arm*, Deut. vi. 8. 15. To make *fringes*, Num. xv. 38–40. 16. To put writings of the Scripture on the *posts of our doors*, Deut. vi. 9. 17. That the *people* be called together to *hear the law*, at the end of the feast of tabernacles, Deut. xxxi. 12. 18. That *every one* write him a *copy* of the law, Deut. xxxi. 19. 19. That the *king*, moreover, write out *another* for himself as king, Deut. xvii. 18. 20. That at our eating of meat *we give thanks*, or bless God, Deut. viii. 10. This is the first family; which, though it sometimes fails in educing its precepts from the word, yet good use may be made of the observation in reducing these things to one certain head.

7. The second family of the first general head of affirmative precepts, contains those which concern the SANCTUARY AND PRIESTHOOD, being nineteen in number:—1. That a *sanctuary*, tabernacle, or temple, should be *built*, Exod. xxv. 8. 2. That, being built, it should be *reverenced*, Lev. xix. 30. 3. That the priests and Levites always *keep the temple*, and no others, Num. xviii. 2. 4. That the work or *ministry* of the temple be performed by the *Levites*, Num. xviii. 23. 5. That the priests *wash their hands and feet* before their ministry, Exod. xxx. 19, 20. 6. That the priests attend the *lamps* of the sanctuary, Exod. xxvii. 21. 7. That the priests *bless the people*, Num. vi. 23. 8. That every [Sabbath] day *the shew-bread be renewed*, Exod. xxv. 30. 9. That *incense* be offered twice a day on the golden altar, Exod. xxx. 7, 8. 10. That the *fire on the altar* be kept always burning, Lev. vi. 12, 13. 11. That the *ashes* be removed from the altar every day, Lev. vi. 10. 12. That the *unclean* be separated from the camp and tabernacle, Num. v. 2; Deut. xxiii. 10. 13. That *Aaron and his posterity* have the principal place and honour in sacred things, Lev. xxi. 8. 14. That the *priests* wear the *garments* appointed to their special ministry, Exod. xxviii. 2. 15. That the *ark* be carried on the *shoulders* of the Levites, Num. vii. 9. 16. That the *anointing oil* be made to anoint king and priest, Exod. xxx. 25–30. 17. That the *families of the priests* minister in the

sanctuary by turns, but that all be present at the great anniversary feasts, Deut. xvi. 16. 18. That the priests *mourn* and be defiled for their near relations, Lev. xxi. 2. 19. That the high priest *marry a virgin*, Lev. xxi. 13.

This is the second family, liable to the same mistakes in many things with the former, but yet containing a collection of things suitable to each other, and belonging, for the most part, to the same general head.

8. The third family relates to SACRIFICES, containing fifty-seven precepts; as,—1. That the תָּמִיד, "tamid," or continual sacrifice, be offered every day, Exod. xxix. 38; Num. xxviii. 2, 3. 2. That the high priest offer his mincha or corban every day, Lev. vi. 20. 3. That every Sabbath-day *two lambs* of a year old be offered as a sacrifice, morning and evening, Num. xxviii. 9. 4. That the sacrifice of the *new moon* be observed, Num. xxviii. 11. 5. That during the feast of the passover the *especial sacrifices* appointed be added to the continual sacrifice, Lev. xxiii. 6–8; Num. xxviii. 31. 6. That at the feast of Pentecost the offering of *new corn* be observed, Lev. xxiii. 10. 7. That it be accompanied with *alms*. 8. Likewise that on the day of *expiation*, Num. xxix. 7; 9. And that on the *feast of tabernacles* for seven days, Lev. xxiii. 34. 10. That on the *eighth*, or last day of the feast, Num. xxix. 35, 36. 11. That on the second day of the feast of the passover an *omer of meal* [a sheaf of barley?] be offered with a lamb, Lev. xxiii. 12. That on the feast of Pentecost *two new loaves* be offered, with its especial sacrifice, Lev. xxiii. 17. 13. That all things be done aright on the feast of *expiation*, Lev. xvi. (These general things are evidently put in to fill up the number of precepts that they had fixed on, there being no special precept in them.) 14. That *three times* in the year *an holy feast* be kept unto the Lord, Exod. xxiii. 14. 15. That on these feasts all the *males* appear before the Lord, Deut. xvi. 16. 16. That they should *rejoice* in all their feasts, Deut. xvi. 14. 17. That the *paschal lamb* be slain, Exod. xii. 6. 18. That his flesh be *eaten roasted*, Exod. xii. 8. 19. That on the second month, on the fourteenth day, *another passover* be kept; 20. That the lamb be then eaten with *unleavened bread* and *sour herbs*, Num. ix. 10, 11. 21. That the *sounding of trumpets* be used with the sacrifice on the day of the afflicting of their souls, Num. x. 10. 22. That the creatures to be sacrificed should be *eight days old* and upwards, Lev. xxii. 27. 23. That every creature to be sacrificed be *perfect*, Lev xxii. 19. 24. That *salt* be used in all sacrifices, Lev. ii. 13. 25. That *whole burnt offerings* be ordered according to the law, Lev. i. 3. 26. That so also be the *sin offering*, Lev. vi. 25; 27. And likewise the *trespass offering*, Lev. vii. 1; 28. And the *peace offering*, Lev. vii. 11; 29. And the *meat offering*, Lev. ii. 1. 30. That if the *whole congregation*

offend, a sacrifice be offered for it, Lev. iv. 13. 31. If a *private man* sin by ignorance, he must offer his sin offering, Lev. iv. 27. 32. That a sacrifice be offered for an *uncertain crime*, Lev. v. 17, 18. 33. That a sacrifice be offered for *sin certain* and known, Lev. v. 15, 16. vi. 2–7. 34. That every one's sacrifice be according to his *substance* or wealth, Lev. v. 7. 35. That whosoever sinneth, together with his sacrifice he make *confession* of his sin, Num. v. 6, 7. 36. That *involuntary* pollution be cleansed by sacrifice, Lev. xv. 13, 14. 37. That *women* do so likewise in the case mentioned, Lev. xv. 28, 29. 38. That the *leper*, being cleansed, do offer sacrifice, Lev. xiv. 10. 39. That a woman *after child-birth* offer sacrifice, Lev. xii. 6–8. 40. That the *tenth of every clean beast* be separated unto the Lord, Lev. xxvii. 32. 41. That every *first-born male* be sanctified and offered unto the Lord, Exod. xiii. 2; Deut. xv. 19. 42. That every *first-born of man* be redeemed with a certain price, Num. xviii. 15. 43. That the *first-born of an ass* be redeemed with a lamb, Exod. xiii. 13. 44. That if it be not redeemed, *its neck be broken*, Exod. xiii. 13. 45. That any sacred beast, that is, *firstling* or *tenth*, wherein is a blemish, be redeemed, Deut. xv. 19–21. 46. That which is *changed*, and that which it is changed for, are to be both the Lord's, Lev. xxvii. 10. 47. That all offerings, both necessary on legal prescription and free-will offerings, be brought unto *Jerusalem* on the next feast, Deut. xii. 5, 6. 48. That all sacrifices be offered at the *sanctuary*, Deut. xii. 14. 49. That sacrifices vowed out of the Holy Land be offered at *Jerusalem*, Deut. xii. 20, 26, 27. 50. That *Aaron and his sons* eat the remainder of the meat offerings, Lev. vi. 16. 51. That the *males* of the house of the priests eat the flesh of the sin and trespass offering, Exod. xxix. 32, 33. 52. That *holy flesh* which hath touched any unclean thing be burned in the fire, Lev. vii. 19. 53. That the flesh of the sacrifices that remain until the *third day* be consumed with fire, Lev. vii. 17. 54. That a *Nazarite* suffer his hair to grow, Num. vi. 5. 55. That he *shave his hair* after his vow is accomplished, Num. vi. 18. 56. That every man perform his *vows* to God, Deut. xxiii. 23; Num. xxx. 2. 57. That *judgment* be made of the obligation of vows according to the law, Num. xxx.

9. The fourth family of affirmative commands respects CLEANNESS AND UNCLEANNESS, whereof they reckon up eighteen precepts: —1. *He that touches that which dies of itself* is unclean, Lev. xi. 39. 2. Eight kinds of *creeping things* are unclean, Lev. xi. 29, 30. 3. Sundry things that may be *eaten* are yet capable of uncleanness, Lev. xi. 34. 4. A woman in her *natural disease* is unclean, Lev. xv. 19; 5. And she that is *delivered of a child*, Lev. xii. 2. 6. The *leper* is unclean, and defileth other things, Lev. xiii. 2, 3. 7. A *cloth* infected with leprosy is unclean, Lev. xiii. 47–51; 8. And an *house* likewise,

Lev. xiv. 35–44. 9. He that hath an *issue* is unclean, Lev. xv. 2; 10. And to the same purpose, Lev. xv. 16; 11. And in a *woman*, verse 25. 12. A *dead body* is unclean, and defileth, Num. xix. 14. 13. All cleansing must be accompanied with *bathing* or washing, Lev. xv. 16. 14. The cleansing of the leper must be with *cedar, hyssop, scarlet wool*, and the other ceremonies, Lev. xiv. 2–32. 15. The leper *must shave all the hair off his head* on the seventh day, Lev. xiv. 9. 16. The leper *must not go abroad* but with the signs of his leprosy, Lev. xiii. 45. 17. That the *red heifer* be burned according to order, Num. xix. 2–10. 18. That the *water of the ashes* of a red heifer be sprinkled in purification, Num. xix. 17–19.

10. The fifth family of this sort of commands concerns ALMS AND TITHES, consisting of thirty-two precepts:—1. That alms be given to the *poor*, Deut. xv. 8. 2. That he who promiseth the price of redemption *for the first-born* pay it assuredly, Lev. xxvii. 2. 3. That he who is to pay the redemption price of *an unclean firstling* pay it accordingly, Lev. xxvii. 11, 12. 4. That the price of *a devoted house* be so paid, according to the judgment of the priest, Lev. xxvii. 14. 5. The same of a *field*, Lev. xxvii. 16. 6. That he who *deceiveth* by ignorance add a fifth part unto the price of the thing itself, Lev. v. 15, 16. 7. That the *fruits of the fourth year* be dedicated to God, Lev. xix. 24. 8. That the *corners of the fields* be left unto the poor to cut and gather, Lev. xix. 9. 9. That *ears of corn* be left for the poor in harvest, Lev. xix. 9. 10. That a *sheaf of corn forgotten* be left for the poor, not sought for again, Deut. xxiv. 19. 11. That *the gleanings of the vine branches* be left to the poor, Lev. xix. 10; 12. And the *grapes* that fall to the ground, Lev. xix. 10. 13. That all *first fruits* of the earth be brought to the sanctuary or temple, Exod. xxiii. 19. 14. That the *words appointed*, Deut. xxvi. 5–10, be repeated over the first fruits. 15. That the *heave offering*, or terumah for the priest, be observed, Deut. xviii. 3. 16. That the *tithes* be separated for the use of the Levites, Num. xviii. 14. 17. That a *second tithe* be taken by the owners, to spend at the tabernacle or at Jerusalem, Deut. xiv. 22, 23. 18. That out of the tenth of the Levites, *a tenth be taken for the priests*, Num. xviii. 26–28. 19. That on the third and sixth year, in the room of this second tenth, *a tenth be given to the poor*, Deut. xiv. 28, 29. 20. That *confession* be made over the tithes, Deut. xxvi. 12–15. 21. That *a cake of the dough* be separated unto the priests, Num. xv. 20. 22. That the whole *increase of the land* every seventh year be common to all, Exod. xxiii. 10, 11. 23. That the *seventh year* be a year of rest unto the whole land, Exod. xxiii. 10, 11; Lev. xxv. 3, 4. 24. That the year of the jubilee be *reckoned by the years of rest*, or weeks of years, Lev. xxv. 8–10. 25. That the year of jubilee be *separated* or sanctified, Lev. xxv. 10. 26. That on the tenth day of the month Tisri the *trumpet sound* for the beginning

of the jubilee, Lev. xxv. 9. 27. That *a redemption* or restitution of the land be granted in the year of jubilee, Lev. xxv. 24. 28. He that *sells an house* in a walled town may redeem it within a year, Lev. xxv. 29. 29. That *debts* be remitted on the seventh year, Deut. xv. 1, 2. 30. That in all offerings and sacrifices for sin, the priest have the *right shoulder*, the *breast*, and the *cheeks*, for his portion, Deut. xviii. 3. 31. That the *first fleece* of sheep being shorn be given to the priest, Deut. xviii. 4. 32. That right judgment be made of *things devoted*, as to the part of God and that of the priests.

11. The sixth family contains seven precepts about THINGS TO BE EATEN:—1. That all creatures to be eaten, beasts and birds, have their *heads* taken off, Deut. xii. 23, 24. 2. That the *blood* of beasts and birds killed to be eaten be covered with earth or dust, Lev. xvii. 13. 3. That the *mother* be left free from the nest when the young ones are taken, Deut. xxii. 6. 4. That the signs of *clean* and *unclean beasts* be diligently observed, Lev. xi. 1–8. 5. That signs to the same purpose be observed in some *birds*, Deut. xiv. 11–20; 6. And the same concerning *locusts* that may be eaten, Lev. xi. 21, 22. 7. That the signs in *fishes* be observed, Lev. xi. 9–12.

12. The seventh family of affirmative precepts respects the PASSOVER and other feasts, as to the time of their observation, having twenty commands appertaining unto it:—1. That the *course of the sun and moon* be exactly observed, for the right constitution of the anniversary feasts, Deut. xvi. 6. 2. That the *beginning of the months* be appointed by the house of judgment, Exod. xii. 2. 3. That we *rest on the Sabbath*, Exod. xxiii. 12. 4. That the *Sabbath* be sanctified, Exod. xx. 8. 5. That all *leaven* be thrust out of doors on the feast of the passover, Exod. xii. 15. 6. That on *the night of the passover*, the first discourse be about the deliverance out of Egypt, Exod. xiii. 8. 7. That *unleavened bread* be eaten on that night, Exod. xii. 18. 8. That the *first* day of the feast of the passover be a day of rest; 9. Likewise the *seventh* day also, Exod. xii. 16; Lev. xxiii. 7, 8. 10. That forty-nine days be reckoned to the *feast of weeks*, Lev. xxiii. 15. 11. That on the *fiftieth day* rest be declared, Lev. xxiii. 21. 12. That on the *first day of the seventh month* there be rest from all works, Lev. xxiii. 24. 13. That the *trumpet sound* on that day, Num. xxix. 1. 14. That every one afflict his own soul on *the tenth day of September*, Lev. xxiii. 27–29. 15. That there be a rest and ceasing from all works on the *day of expiation*, Lev. xxiii. 32. 16. That there be a rest from labour on *the first day of the feast of tabernacles*, Lev. xxiii. 35; 17. Likewise on *the eighth day*, Lev. xxiii. 36. 18. That the people *dwell in booths seven days*, Lev. xxiii. 42. 19. That on *the first day of the feast of tabernacles* branches of palms be carried, Lev. xxiii. 40. 20. That every Israelite that is a male offer *every year half a shekel* to the Lord, Exod. xxx. 13.

13. The eighth family concerns RULE AND JUDGMENT, made up of thirteen precepts:—1. That obedience be yielded to every *prophet* speaking in the name of God, Deut. xviii. 15. 2. That the people choose a *king*, Deut. xvii. 15. 3. That *judges* and *rulers* be appointed in every city of the people, Deut. xvi. 18. 4. That the laws and decrees of the *great council* be observed and obeyed, Deut. xvii. 10. 5. That in doubtful cases the *major part of suffrages* is to determine, Exod. xxiii. 1. 6. That all men be *judged equally*, without respect, Lev. xix. 15. 7. That every one who can *testify the truth* in any cause, is of his own accord to repair to the judges so to do, Lev. v. 1. 8. That *witnesses* be examined strictly, and their testimony duly weighed, Deut. xiii. 14. 9. That *false witnesses* have that done to them which they would have done unto others, or brought upon them, Deut. xix. 18, 19. 10. That a calf be slain where a *dead body is found*, the murderer not being known, Deut. xxi. 1–9. 11. That *six cities of refuge* for the man-slayer be appointed, and the ways to them be prepared, Deut. xix. 2, 3; Num. xxxv. 6. 12. That the *Levites* have cities and suburbs granted them, Num. xxxv. 2. 13. That the *tops of the houses* have a battlement about them, Deut. xxii. 8.

14. The ninth family of affirmative precepts respects TRUTH AND DOCTRINES, comprehending twenty-five commands:—1. That the *idolatry* of the Gentiles be extirpated out of the land, Deut. xii. 2. 2. That the *city* and *citizens* which fall into idolatry be utterly destroyed, Deut. xiii. 12–16. 3. That the *seven nations of Canaan* be blotted out, Deut. vii. 1, 2. 4. That the Israelites remember what *Amalek* did unto them, Deut. xxv. 17. 5. That the *memory of Amalek* be blotted out from under heaven, Exod. xvii. 14. 6. That *war* be undertaken and managed according to the law, Deut. xx. 7. That a *priest* be anointed to go forth to the war, Deut. xx. 2 8. That every one carry a *paddle* with his arms, Deut. xxiii. 13 9. That a place be assigned for covering of *ejections of nature*, Deut xxiii. 12. 10. That what is *stolen* be restored, Lev. vi. 4. 11. That an *Hebrew servant* be well rewarded at the end of his service, Deut. xv. 14. 12. That we *lend freely* to the poor and needy, Exod. xxii. 25. 13. That the *pledge* be restored unto the owner, Deut. xxiv. 13. 14. That the *labourer* be paid his hire or wages the same day, Deut. xxiv. 15. 15. That the *hireling* working in the field or vineyard may eat of the fruits to his satisfaction, Deut. xxiii. 24, 25. 16. That we help the *beast of our neighbour* fallen under his burden, Exod. xxiii. 5. 17. That we help our neighbour in *leading* his beast by the way, Deut. xxii. 4. 18. That what is *lost* by one and found by another be restored to the owner, Deut. xxii. 1–3. 19. That we rebuke our neighbour when he sinneth or offendeth, Lev. xix. 17. 20. That we *love* our neighbour, Lev. xix 18. 21. That we love a *stranger*, Deut. x. 19. 22. That *weights*, and *measures*, and

scales, be exact, Lev. xix. 36. 23. That *wise men*, or men skilful in the law, be honoured, or had in reputation, Lev. xix. 32. 24. That *father* and *mother* be honoured, Exod. xx. 12. 25. That they be *feared*, Lev. xix. 3.

15. The tenth family concerns WOMEN AND MATRIMONY, in twelve precepts:—1. That *marriage* be entered into by all, Gen. i. 28. 2. That a *contract* or betrothing precede marriage, Deut. xx. 7. 3. That the *new married man* rejoice with his wife the first year, Deut. xxiv. 5. 4. That the *male children* of Israel be circumcised, Gen. xvii. 10; Lev. xii. 3. 5. That the *widow* of a man dying without children marry unto her husband's brother, Deut. xxv. 5. 6. That he who *refuseth* so to take the widow of one dying without children, being next of kin, have his shoe pulled off, and be spit upon, Deut. xxv. 7–9. 7. That he who hath violated the *chastity* of a virgin by force be compelled to marry her, Deut. xxii. 29. 8. That he who hath *defamed* his wife without cause keep her without hope of divorce, Deut. xxii. 13–19. 9. That he who *seduceth* a virgin to fornication pay fifty shekels, Exod. xxii. 16, 17. 10. That a *fair woman* taken in war be dealt withal according to the law, Deut. xxi. 10–14. 11. That *divorce* be made by a writing, or bill of divorcement, Deut. xxiv. 1. 12. That a woman *suspected* of adultery be dealt withal according to the law, Num. v. 30.

16. The eleventh family concerneth CRIMINAL JUDGMENTS AND PUNISHMENTS, and hath eight precepts belonging unto it:—1. That *criminal persons* not guilty of sins deserving capital punishment be beaten with stripes, Deut. xxv. 2, 3. 2. That he who *slew a man at unawares* be banished from conversing among the people, Num. xxxv. 25. 3. That those guilty of it be *hanged* or strangled, Deut. xxi. 22. 4. That others, as is appointed, be *slain by the sword*, Exod. xxi. 20; 5. That others be *burned*, Lev. xx. 14. 6. That those who deserve it by the law be *stoned* with stones, Deut. xxi. 21. 7. That those appointed thereunto be *hanged up after death*, Deut. xxi. 21. 8. That all who suffer death be *buried* the same day, Deut. xxi. 23.

17. The twelfth and last family of this sort of precepts, which is about JUDGMENTS IN CIVIL CAUSES, contains seventeen precepts:—1. That the *Hebrew servant* be dealt withal according to the law, Exod. xxi. 2–6. 2. That *an Hebrew maid servant* be married to her master or his son, if humbled by either of them, Exod. xxi. 8, 9. 3. That an *Hebrew maid servant* may be redeemed, Exod. xxi. 8. 4. That only *Canaanites*, or heathens, may be made perpetual servants, or brought into bondage for ever, Lev. xxv. 45, 46. 5. That he who procures the *hurt* of any one do repair it by a pecuniary mulct, Exod. xxi. 30. 6. That hurt done by a *beast* be repaired, Exod. xxi. 28, 29. 7. That loss or hurt from the not covering or safeguarding of *a pit* be repaired, Exod. xxi. 33, 34. 8. That *theft* be judged according to the law,

Exod. xxii. 1–4. 9. That the *damage* done by one man's beasts in other men's fields be repaired, Exod. xxii. 5. 10. That *damage by fire*, voluntarily, be repaired, Exod. xxii. 6. 11. That judgment be made of any thing *deposited* or *trusted* without reward, according to the law, Exod. xxii. 7, 8. 12. That what is *lent* or *hired* for gain, if lost, be judged according unto the law, Exod. xxii. 10–13; 13. Also what is *borrowed* for use, Exod. xxii. 14, 15. 14. That things concerning *buying and selling* be judged according to the law, Lev. xxv. 14–17. 15. That the cause of the *plaintiff* and *defendant* be judged according to the law, Exod. xxii. 9. 16. That a man *pursued* by his enemy to death may be delivered with the death of his pursuer, Deut. xix. 6. 17. That the *rights of inheritances* be determined according to the law, Num. xxvii. 8–11.

18. These are the precepts which they gather out of the law, as affirmatively expressed. That some of them are by no means rightly educed from those texts which they draw them from, will appear at first view unto him that shall examine them. It is also justly questionable whether sundry of them be indeed precepts of God or no, especially as by them explained. But that this is the just number of the affirmative precepts of the law, that there are no more of that kind, and that these are all so many distinct precepts, is vain to imagine. Only whereas, in general, the most of the particular commands that belong unto the same things are gathered by them into certain heads, wherein they are summarily represented, I thought not unmeet to give them here in their order.

19. The *negative precepts* also are by them in like manner cast into twelve distinct families, which, with the same brevity, we shall pass through.

20. The first family of these precepts relates unto FALSE WORSHIP, concerning which they gather up forty-seven prohibitions:—1. That we have *no other god* but Jehovah, Exod. xx. 3. 2. That we make *no images for ourselves*, nor have others make them for us, Exod. xx. 4. 3. That we make *no images for others*, or for their use, Deut. xii. 3, 4. 4. That we make *no images for ornament*, Exod. xx. 23. 5. That we *bow not down* to any idols; 6. Nor *serve* them, Exod. xx. 5. 7. That none offer his son or daughter to *Moloch* in the fire, Lev. xviii. 21. 8. That none have a *familiar spirit* or *Ob;* 9. That none have a *familiar spirit* or *Jideoni*, Lev. xix. 31. 10. That none consult with *Ob.* 11. That none ask counsel of *Jideoni*, Deut. xviii. 11. 12. That we *look not* towards idols, Lev. xix. 4. 13. That we *set not up* a statue or image anywhere, Deut. xvi. 22. 14. That no painted or *carved stone* be set up to be bowed unto, Lev. xxvi. 1. 15. That no *tree* be planted in the sanctuary, Deut. xvi. 21. 16. That we *swear not* by false gods, Exod. xxxiii. 13. 17. That none *lead* the Jews to idolatry; 18. That none stir up

any *single Jew* to idolatry, Deut. xiii. 6–11. 19. That we *love not* a seducer; 20. That we *hate* him; 21. That we *aid him not* in danger of death; 22. That he whom he would seduce *intercede not* for him; 23. That he *conceal* nothing which may tend to his condemnation, Deut. xiii. 8. 24. That we *covet not*, or turn to our use, any things wherewith idols have been adorned, Deut. vii. 25. 25. That we *make no profit* of any thing that belongs to false worship, Deut. vii. 26. 26. That *no city seduced* to idolatry and destroyed be ever built again, Deut. xiii. 16. 27. That nothing of its *spoils* be turned to private use, Deut. xiii. 17. 28. That none *prophesy falsely*, Deut. xviii. 20. 29. That we fear not to *slay* a false prophet, Deut. xviii. 22. 30. That none *prophesy in the name of false gods*, Deut. xviii. 20. 31. That none so prophesying be *attended unto*, Deut. xiii. 2, 3. 32. That we *walk not* in the ways and customs of the heathens, Lev. xx. 23. 33. That none use *divination*, Deut. xviii. 10; 34. Nor *sorcery*, Deut. xviii. 10. 35. That no *soothsaying* be used, Lev. xix. 26. 36. That no *divination by times* or *hours* be used, Lev. xix. 26. 37. That there be no *enchantment* or conjuring, Deut. xviii. 10. 38. That none ask *counsel of the dead*, Deut. xviii. 11. 39. That a *woman wear not* the apparel of a man; 40. That a *man wear not* the apparel of a woman, Deut. xxii. 5. 41. That no *cutting* or incision be made in the body, Lev. xix. 28. 42. That clothes made of *linen and woollen* be not made or worn, Deut. xxii. 11. 43. That the *corners of the head* be not *rounded;* 44. That the *corners of the beard* be not *marred*, Lev. xix. 27. 45. That none *tear their flesh* with their *nails;* 46. Nor *pull off their hair* for the *dead*, Deut. xiv. 1. 47. That we walk not after the thoughts of our hearts or sight of our eyes, Num. xv. 39.

21. It is evident that in this family many precepts are distinguished, and the number multiplied thereby. In particular, the second command is divided into two or three, which God makes to be but one, and general rules are made particular prohibitions; all to fill up the number which they had designed. However, most things, as we observed before, belonging to this general head, are brought into this collection.

22. The second family concerns SEPARATION FROM THE HEATHEN, in thirteen prohibitions:—1. That *no covenant* be made with any of the seven nations of *Canaan*, Deut. vii. 1, 2. 2. That none of them be suffered *to live*, Deut. xx. 16. 3. That we *pity not* those idolaters, Deut. vii. 2. 4. That we suffer them not *to inhabit* in the land, Exod. xxiii. 33. 5. That *no marriages* be made with the heathen, Deut. vii. 3. 6. That no *Ammonite* or *Moabite* marry a Jewish woman, Deut. xxiii. 3. 7. That no peace be offered to the *Ammonites* or *Moabites*, as to other nations, Deut. xxiii. 6. 8. That they separate not from the *Edomites* beyond the third generation;

9. Nor from the *Egyptians*, Deut. xxiii. 7, 8. 10. That they never return to dwell in *Egypt*, Deut. xvii. 16. 11. That they destroy not *fruit trees*, Deut. xx. 19. 12. That *soldiers* in war be not fearful, Deut. xx. 3. 13. That they forget not the wickedness of *Amalek*, Deut. xxv. 17–19.

23. The third family of this sort of precepts concerns the due regard that is to be had to THINGS SACRED, in twenty-nine precepts:—1. That none *blaspheme*, Lev. xxiv. 16. 2. That none *swear falsely*, Lev. xix. 12. 3. That none *swear in vain*, Exod. xx. 7. 4. That the *name of God* be not profaned, Lev. xxii. 32. 5. That *God* be not contemned, Deut. vi. 16. 6. That *holy places* be not destroyed, Deut. xii. 4. 7. That he who is *hanged* on a tree abide not all night thereon, Deut. xxi. 23. 8. That the *watch* about the sanctuary fail not, Num. xviii. 5. 9. That the *priest* go not at all hours into the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 2. 10. That none *defiled* come to the *altar*, Lev. xxi. 23. 11. That none *defiled* serve in the *sanctuary*, Lev. xxi. 17. 12. That none *polluted* by accident draw nigh to the holy service, Lev. xxi. 21. 13. That the *Levites* invade not the priests' office, nor the *priests* do the work of the Levites, Num. xviii. 2–5. 14. That none who have *drunk wine* enter the sanctuary, Lev. x. 9. 15. That no *stranger* serve in the sanctuary, Num. xviii. 4. 16. That no *priest that is unclean* draw nigh to it; 17. Nor on that day wherein he washeth from his uncleanness until it be evening, Lev. xxii. 1–7. 18. That no *unclean person* enter into any part of the temple, Num. v. 3; 19. Nor into the *camp* or tents of the Levites, Deut. xxiii. 10. 20. That the *altar* be not built of hewn stones, Exod. xx. 25. 21. That they go not up by *steps* to the altar, Exod. xx. 26. 22. That no sacrifices be offered on the *golden altar*, Exod. xxx. 9. 23. That no *oil* or ointment be made like that of the tabernacle; 24. That no *stranger* be anointed with it, Exod. xxx. 31–33. 25. That no *incense* or perfume like that prescribed in the law be made, Exod. xxx. 37. 26. That the *fire on the altar* go not out, Lev. vi. 12 27. That the *bars* or *staves* be not pulled out of the sides of the ark, Exod. xxv 15. 28. That the *breast-plate* in the high priest's garment be not loosed from the ephod, Exod. xxviii. 28. 29. That the *robe of the ephod* be not torn or rent, Exod. xxviii. 32.

24. The fourth family is comprehensive of the prohibitions given about SACRIFICES AND PRIESTS, being in number eighty-two:—1. That no *sacrifice* be used but at the temple, Deut. xii. 13, 14. 2. That no *sacred beast* be killed but at the temple, Lev. xvii. 3, 4. 3. That no *blemished thing* be brought to the altar, Lev. xxii. 20. 4. That no blemished thing be offered in *sacrifice*, Lev. xxii. 21, 22. 5. That the *blood* of a blemished beast be never laid on the altar, Lev. xxii. 24; 6. Nor the fat of it, Lev. xxii. 22. 7. That no beast with an *accidental blemish* be offered, Deut. xvii. 1. 8. That no blemished

beast *received of a heathen* or Gentile be offered, Lev. xxii. 25. 9. That no blemish be in any *dedicated beast* or *firstling*, Lev. xxii. 21. 10. That no offering be of *leaven* or *honey*, Lev. ii. 11. 11. That no sacrifice be without *salt*, Lev. ii. 13. 12. That the price of a *dog* or an *whore* be not offered to God, Deut. xxiii. 18. 13. That a *beast and its young* be not killed or sacrificed the same day, Lev. xxii. 28. 14. That no *oil* be put to the offering of him that offers the sin offering; 15. Nor *frankincense*, Lev. v. 11. 16. That oil be not put to the gift of a *woman suspected to have gone astray;* 17. Nor frankincense, Num. v. 15. 18. That no *devoted beast* be changed, Lev. xxvii. 32, 33. 19. That one sacrifice be not *changed* into another, or for another, Lev. xxvii. 26. 20. That the *firstling* of a clean beast be not redeemed, Num. xviii. 17. 21. That the *tenths* of beasts be not sold, Lev. xxvii. 32, 33. 22. That a *devoted field* be not sold; 23. Nor redeemed, Lev. xxvii. 28. 24. That the *head of the bird* to be offered on the day of expiation be not separated from the body, Lev. v. 8. 25. That *sacred beasts* be not used to labour; 26. Nor be shorn, Deut. xv. 19. 27. That the *paschal lamb* be not slain whilst any leaven remains, Exod. xxiii. 18. 28. That *nothing be left* of the paschal lamb, Exod. xii. 10. 29. That nothing be left of the paschal lamb to be offered on the *second month*, Num. ix. 12. 30. That no *bone* of the paschal lamb be broken, Exod. xii. 46. 31. That its flesh be not eaten *raw* or *boiled*, Exod. xii. 9. 32. That nothing of its flesh be carried out of the company by whom it is to be eaten, Exod. xii. 46. 33. That no *stranger* or hireling eat of it, Exod. xii. 45. 34. That no *uncircumcised person* eat of it, Exod. xii. 48. 35. That no Israelite that hath been *changed* do eat of it, Exod. xii. 43. 36. That the *fat* of it abide not one night, Exod. xxiii. 18. 37. That the *flesh* of the peace offerings be not kept until the morning, Lev. vii. 15. 38. That nothing remain of sacrifices to the third day, Lev. vii. 16, 17. 39. That the *priests' portion* of the sacrifices or meat offerings be not baked with leaven, Lev. vi. 16, 17. 40. That no *unclean person* eat that which is holy, Lev. vii. 20. 41. That the *holy things* once defiled be not eaten, Lev. vii. 19. 42. That what *remains* of the sacrifices above the time appointed be not eaten, Lev. xix. 18. 43. That nothing be eaten which is an abomination, Lev. vii. 18. 44. That no *stranger* eat of holy flesh; 45. Nor a *foreigner*, Exod. xii. 45; 46. Nor the *hired servant* of the priest, Lev. xxii. 10; 47. Nor he that is *uncircumcised*, Exod. xii. 48. 48. Nor the *priest* when he is *defiled*, Lev. xxii. 3; 49. Nor the *daughter of the priest* which is married to a stranger, Lev. xxii. 12. 50. That the *offerings* of the priests be not eaten, Lev. vi. 20–22. 51. That the *inwards* of the sin offering be not eaten, Lev. vi. 30. 52. That *beasts made holy* that are any ways corrupted be not eaten, Deut. xiv. 3. 53. That the *second tenths* of fruits be not eaten out of

Jerusalem; 54. That the tenth of the *wine* be not drunk; 55. That the tenth of the *oil* be not eaten elsewhere, Deut. xii. 17, 18. 56. That the priests eat not the firstlings out of *Jerusalem*, Deut. xiv. 23. 57. That they eat not the sin offering out of the *holy place*, Deut. xiv. 23. 58. That none of the flesh of the *burnt offering* be eaten, Deut. xii. 27. 59. That the flesh of the *free-will offering* be not eaten before the blood of the sacrifice be poured upon the altar. 60. That the priest eat not the *first fruits* before he have laid it up in the temple. 61. That no stranger eat that which is *most holy*, Exod. xxix. 33. 62. That the *second tenths* be not eaten in mourning; 63. Nor in *uncleanness*. 64. That the *money* it is sold for be not laid out in any thing but what is to be eaten or drunken, Deut. xxvi. 13, 14. 65. That *no meat* be eaten before the things to be separated from it be taken away, Lev. xxii. 25. 66. That the order of *tenths*, and first fruits or heave offerings, be not perverted, Exod. xxii. 29. 67. That *vows* be not deferred, Deut. xxiii. 22. 68. That none go up to the *passover* without a sacrifice, Exod. xxiii. 15. 69. That none *break his vows*, Num. xxx. 2. 70. That the high priest marry not an *whore;* 71. Nor one any way *corrupted;* 72. Nor one *divorced;* 73. Nor a *widow*, Lev. xxi. 7; 74. Nor *defile himself* with a widow, Lev. xxi. 13–15. 75. That the priests enter not the sanctuary with *long hair;* 76. Nor with *torn garments*, Lev. x. 6, xxi. 10. 77. That the priests go not forth of the temple at the time of divine worship, Lev. x. 7. 78. That no inferior priest defile himself for the death of *strangers*, Lev. xxi. 1. 79. That the high priest defile not himself, no not for his *parents*, Lev. xxi. 10, 11. 80. That he go not in where is any *dead*, Lev. xxi. 11. 81. That the tribe of Levi have no *lot in the land;* 82. That they have no lot in the *spoils of war*, Deut. xviii. 1, 2.

25. The fifth family of negative precepts compriseth thirty-eight prohibitions about MEATS, or what may be eaten:—1. That no *unclean beast* be eaten, Lev. xi. 4–8. 2. That no *unclean fish* be eaten, Lev. xi. 9–12. 3. That no *unclean bird* or fowl be eaten, Lev. xi. 13–23. 4. That no *creeping thing* that also *flieth* be eaten, Lev. xi. 23. 5. That no *creeping thing of the earth* be eaten, Lev. xi. 41. 6. That no *creeping thing of the waters* be eaten, Lev. xi. 43. 7. That no *worms* of the earth be eaten, Lev. xi. 44; 8. Nor the *worms of fruit*, Lev. xi. 42. 9. That what *dieth of itself* be not eaten, Deut. xiv. 21; 10. Nor that which is *torn*, Exod. xxii. 31. 11. That no *blood* be eaten, Lev. vii. 26. 12. That the *fat* be not eaten, Lev. vii. 23. 13. That no *member* taken from a living creature be eaten, Deut. xii. 23. 14. That the *sinew which shrank* be not eaten, Gen. xxxii. 32. 15. That flesh be not *boiled in the milk* of the beast whose it is; 16. That the flesh be not *eaten with milk*, Exod. xxiii. 19. 17. That the flesh of an ox *stoned* for pushing or goring be not eaten, Exod. xxi. 28.

18. That *new bread* be not eaten until after the offering of the omer; 19. That *parched corn*, 20. That *green ears*, be not eaten until an offering be first given, Lev. xxiii. 14. 21. That the *fruit of a young tree* be not eaten until it hath borne three years, Lev. xix. 23. 22. That a *mixture of fruits* from the vineyard be not eaten, Deut. xxii. 9. 23. That *wine* of drink offerings offered to idols be not drunk, Deut. xxxii. 38. 24. That none eat as a *glutton*, Deut. xxi. 20. 25. That none eat on the *day of expiation*, Lev. xxiii. 27, 28. 26. That no *leaven* be eaten on the passover, Exod. xii. 15; 27. Nor any thing *mixed with leaven*, Exod. xii. 20. 28. That no leaven be eaten on the even of the *passover*, Deut. xvi. 3. 29. That no leaven be found in our houses after that time, Exod. xii. 19. 30. That no leaven be found in any place under our power, Exod. xiii. 7. 31. That the *Nazarite* drink no wine, nor any thing that comes of it; 32. That he eat no *green grapes;* 33. Nor *pressed grapes;* 34. Nor the *kernels of the grapes;* 35. Nor the *husks* of them, Num. vi. 2–4. 36. That he *shave not* his head; 37. That he *defile not himself* for the dead; 38. That he enter not an house where any is dead, Num. vi. 5–7.

26. The sixth family compriseth eighteen prohibitions about FIELDS AND HARVEST:—1. That the *whole field* be not mowed or reaped; 2. That the *ears which fall* in reaping be not gathered up; 3. That the *grapes left* by vine-gatherers be not sought after; 4. That the *unripe grapes* be not gathered, Lev. xix. 9, 10. 5. That men return not for a *sheaf forgotten*, Deut. xxiv. 19. 6. That *mixed seeds* be not sown in the same field, Lev. xix. 19. 7. That *plants of several kinds* be not set in the same vineyard, Deut. xxii. 9. 8. That there be no *mixture of beasts* of several sorts, Lev. xix. 19. 9. That we *plough not* with an ox and an ass, Deut. xxii. 10. 10. That the mouth of a beast labouring in that which may be eaten be not *muzzled*, Deut. xxv. 4. 11. That in the seventh year the *land* be not ploughed; 12. Nor the *trees* dressed; 13. Nor things moved that *grow on their own ground;* 14. Nor the *fruits* gathered as in other years, Lev. xxv. 1–7. 15. That the earth be not tilled in the *year of jubilee;* 16. Nor things cut down *growing on their own field;* 17. Nor the *fruits* of that year gathered, Lev. xxv. 11. 18. That *no field in the Holy Land* be sold for ever, Lev. xxv. 23.

27. The seventh family they call the HOUSE OF DOCTRINES, unto which head they refer things of sundry kinds which they know not well how to reduce unto one general sort, or head of one name, and it is branched into forty-six prohibitions:—1. That the *Levites* be not forsaken, Deut. xii. 19. 2. That the *fields and suburbs* of the Levites be not changed, Lev. xxv. 34. 3. That no *debt* be claimed after the year of release, Deut. xv. 2. 4. That we forget not to *give to the poor* what they want, Deut. xv. 7, 8. 5. That we omit not to *lend to the poor* because the year of release draws nigh, Deut. xv.

9, 10. 6. That a *Jewish servant* be not set at liberty empty, Deut. xv. 13. 7. That *debt* be not exacted of the *poor*, Lev. xxv. 35. 8. That no money be *lent* unto an Israelite on *usury*, Lev. xxv. 35–37. 9. That what is lent be not *received again with usury*, Deut. xxiii. 19. 10. That we be not *arbitrators* between lenders and borrowers on usury, Exod. xxii. 25. 11. Not to delay payment of *wages*, Lev. xix. 13. 12. That a *pledge* be not taken of a borrower with *rigour* or violence, Deut. xxiv. 10, 11. 13. That the *pledge of a poor man* that wants it be not detained, Deut. xxiv. 12, 13. 14. That a pledge be not taken of a *widow's garments*, Deut. xxiv. 17. 15. That *things necessary to sustain human life* be not taken to pledge, Deut. xxiv. 6. 16. That none *steal*, Exod. xx. 15; 17. Nor take the goods of any by *robbery*, Lev. xix. 11. 18. That we *oppress not* our neighbour; 19. Nor take his goods by *violence*, Lev. xix. 13. 20. That no man *deny* his neighbour's goods that are with him; 21. That none *swear falsely* concerning any thing deposited with him, Lev. xix. 12, 13. 22. That we *straiten not the bounds* of our neighbour, Deut. xix. 14. 23. That none *deceive* his neighbour in *buying and selling*, Lev. xxv. 14. 24. That the *land mark* be not removed, Deut. xix. 14. 25. That we *deceive* him not in *words*, Lev. xxv. 17. 26. That no *stranger* be deceived in *words;* 27. Nor in *buying* or *selling*, Exod. xxii. 21. 28. That the *widow* and *orphan* be not oppressed, Exod. xxii. 22–24. 29. That a *servant fleeing from his master* unto the Holy Land be not given up to him; 30. That he be not *defrauded* in any thing, Deut. xxiii. 15, 16. 31. That an *Hebrew servant* be not used as a bondman; 32. That he be not sold for a *slave;* 33. That service be not exacted of him with *bitterness;* 34. That no *heathen* be suffered to treat him hardly, Lev. xxv. 39–55. 35. That a *Jewish maid-servant* be not sold to another; 36. That the three things required in the law be not denied to such a servant, Exod. xxi. 7–11. 37. That a *fair woman* taken in war be not sold; 38. That she be not used as a *bond-woman*, Deut. xxi. 10–14. 39. That we *covet* not, Exod. xx. 17. 40. That nothing of other men's be desired, Deut. v. 21. 41. That the *hireling* eat whilst he is in the field; 42. That he take no more out of the field than what he can eat, Deut. xxiii. 24. 43. That what is *lost* be not hidden, Deut. xxii. 1–3. 44. That we leave not a *beast* under his burden, Deut. xxii. 4. 45. That there be no *deceit* in weights and measures, Lev. xix. 35. 46. That we keep no *false weights* or *measures* in our houses, Deut. xxv. 13–16.

28. The eighth family relates unto JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT, in forty-six prohibitions:—1. That *justice* be not violated, Lev. xix. 15. 2. That *gifts* be not received in judgment, Exod. xxiii. 8. 3. That none be *respected in judgment*, Lev. xix. 15. 4. That none *fear* a wicked man in judgment, Deut. i. 17. 5. That we pity not a *poor man* in

judgment, Exod. xxiii. 3. 6. That we have no pity for a *manslayer*, or other criminal person, Deut. xix. 11–13. 7. That the judgment of the *poor* be not perverted, Exod. xxiii. 6; 8. Nor of the *stranger*, *widow*, or *orphan*, Deut. xxiv. 17. 9. That one party be not heard in the *absence of another*, Exod. xxiii. 3. 10. That we *decline not after many* in the judgment of law; 11. Nor shall a judge condemn according to the *opinion of another*, but his own, Exod. xxiii. 2. 12. That none be chosen a *judge* that is not learned in the law, though he be wise in other things, Deut. xvi. 18. 13. That none bear *false witness*, Exod. xx. 16. 14. That no *offender* be justified, Exod. xxiii. 1. 15. That *kinsmen* be not witnesses, Deut. xxiv. 16. 16. That none be condemned upon *one witness*, Deut. xix. 15. 17. That none be condemned to death on conjecture, opinions, or thoughts, but upon *clear witnesses*, Exod. xxiii. 7. 18. That we *kill not*, Exod. xx. 13. 19. That a guilty person be not put to death before he *appear in judgment*, Num. xxxv. 12. 20. That no *reward* be taken for the life of a *murderer;* 21. Nor for him that commits *manslaughter by error*, Num. xxxv. 31, 32. 22. That none be *judge* and *witness* in a criminal cause, Num. xxxv. 30. 23. That none pity the *woman* mentioned, Deut. xxv. 11, 12. 24. She that is *forced* is not to be punished, Deut. xxii. 25, 26. 25. That none appear against the *blood of his neighbour*, Lev. xix. 16. 26. That no *cause of offence* or falling be left in an house, Deut. xxii. 8. 27. That none lay a *stumbling-block* before an Israelite, Lev. xix. 14. 28. That the *beating with stripes* exceed not the number of forty, Deut. xxv. 3. 29. That none *calumniate* or accuse falsely, Lev. xix. 16. 30. That we *hate not our neighbour* in our heart, Lev. xix. 17. 31. That none put an Israelite to *reproach*, Lev. xix. 17. 32. That none exercise *revenge* on his neighbour; 33. That none bear *ill-will* in his mind, Lev. xix. 18. 34. That the *mother and its young* be not taken together, Deut. xxii. 6. 35. That a *scall* be not shaven, Lev. xiii. 33. 36. That the *signs of leprosy* be not removed, Lev. xiii. 45, 46. 37. That the *place where the heifer is beheaded* be not tilled, Deut. xxi. 4. 38. That a *sorcerer* be not suffered to live, Lev. xx. 27. 39. That a *new married man* be not bound to go forth to war, Deut. xxiv. 5. 40. That none be *rebellious* against the sanhedrin at Jerusalem, and their doctrine, Deut. xvii. 11. 41. That nothing be *added to* the precepts of the law; 42. That nothing be *taken from* them, Deut. iv. 2. 43. That we *speak not evil* of the *judge*, nor of the *prince of the people*, Exod. xxii. 28. 44. That none *speak evil* of any in Israel, Lev. xix. 14. 45. That none *curse father or mother;* 46. That none *strike father or mother*, Exod. xxi. 17.

29 The ninth family of negative precepts concerns FEASTS, and contains ten prohibitions:—1. That no work be done on the *Sabbath*, Exod. xx. 10. 2. That none go out or *beyond the bounds* of the

city on the Sabbath, Exod. xvi. 29. 3. That no *punishment* be inflicted on the Sabbath, Exod. xxxv. 3. 4. That no work be done on the *first day of the passover;* 5. That no work be done on the *seventh day of the passover*, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8. 6. That no work be done on the *feast of weeks*, Lev. xxiii. 21. 7. That no work be done on the *first day of the seventh month*, Lev. xxiii. 24, 25. 8. That no work be done on the *day of expiation*, Lev. xxiii. 30. 9. That no work be done on the *first day of the feast of tabernacles;* 10. That no work be done on the *eighth day of release*, Lev. xxiii. 34–36.

30. The tenth family of negative precepts is concerning CHASTITY, and AFFINITY, and PURITY, in twenty-four precepts:—1. That none uncover the *nakedness* of his *mother;* 2. Of his *father's wife;* 3. Of his *sister;* 4. Of the *daughter of his father's wife*, Lev. xviii. 7–9, 11; 5. Of the *daughter of his son*; 6. Of the *daughter of his daughter;* 7. Of his *own daughter;* Lev. xviii. 10; 8. Of a *woman and her daughter;* 9. Of a *woman and the daughter of her son;* 10. Of a *woman and the daughter of her daughter*, Lev. xviii. 17; 11. Of a *father's sister;* 12. Of a *mother's sister*, Lev. xviii. 12, 13; 13. Of an *uncle's wife*, Lev. xviii. 14; 14. Of a *daughter-in-law*, Lev. xviii. 15; 15. Of a *brother's wife*, Lev. xviii. 16; 16. Of a *wife's sister*, she being living, Lev. xviii. 18; 17. Of a *married woman*, Exod. xx. 14; 18. Of a *separated woman*, Lev. xviii. 19. 19. That none commit the sin of *sodomy*, Lev. xviii. 22. 20. That none uncover the *nakedness of her father;* 21. Nor of the *brother of her father*, Lev. xviii. 7, 14. 22. That *filthiness* be not committed with any beast by a *man;* 23. Nor by a *woman*, Lev. xviii. 23. 24. That none draw nigh to a *prohibited woman*, Lev. xviii. 6.

31. The eleventh family concerns MARRIAGES, in eight prohibitions:—1. That a *bastard* take not an Israelitess to wife, Deut. xxiii. 2. 2. That no *eunuch* take a daughter of Israel, Deut. xxiii. 1. 3. That no *male* be made an eunuch, Lev. xxi. 17–24. 4. That there be no *whore* in Israel, Deut. xxiii. 17. 5. That he who hath *divorced his wife* may not take her again after she hath been married to another, Deut. xxiv. 4. 6. That a *brother's widow* marry not with a stranger, Deut. xxv. 5. 7. That he divorce not his wife who hath *defamed* her in her youth, Deut. xxii. 19. 8. That he that hath *forced a maid* shall not divorce her, Deut. xxii. 29.

32. The twelfth family concerns THE KINGDOM, and is made up of four precepts:—1. That no *king* be chosen of a strange nation, Deut. xvii. 15. 2. That the king get not himself *many horses*, Deut. xvii. 16. 3. That he multiply not *wives;* 4. That he heap not up to himself *treasures* of silver and gold, Deut. xvii. 17.

33. This is the account that the Jews give of the precepts of the law, and both the number of them, as also their distribution and distinction which they have cast them into, are part, as they pre-

tend, of their oral law: which may easily be improved unto a conviction of the vanity of it; for whereas it is evident that many of these precepts are coincident, many pretended so to be are no precepts at all, and sundry of them are not founded on the places from whence they profess to gather them, yea, that in many of them the mind of the Holy Ghost is plainly perverted, and a contrary sense annexed unto his words,—so it is most unquestionable that there are sundry commands and institutions, especially in, about, and concerning sacrifices, that are no way taken notice of by them in this collection, as I could easily make good by instances sufficient. It is evident that that rule cannot be from God whereof this collection is pretended to be a part; but, as I have said before, because there is a representation in them of no small multitude of commands, especially in things concerning their carnal worship, it was necessary that they should be here represented, though they have been before transcribed from them by others. My principal design herein, is to give light into some passages of our apostle, as also to other expressions concerning this "law of commandments contained in ordinances" in other places of the Scripture.

34. The account our apostle gives of this whole system of divine worship, Heb. ix. 1, 10, "The first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary, ... which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation," is very remarkable. Let any one cast an eye upon this multitude of commands about meats and drinks, washings, and outward carnal, observances, which are here collected, and he will quickly see how directly and pertinently the description given by our apostle is suited to their services, and that not only as to the manner and multitude of them, but also as to their nature. They are carnal things, and could by no means effect the great, spiritual, glorious, and eternal ends which God had designed, proposed, and promised, in that covenant unto whose administration they were annexed until "the time of reformation" should come. Hence elsewhere, as Col. ii. 20, he calls them "the rudiments of the world,"—ordinances about touching, tasting, and handling, about meats and drinks, things outwardly clean or unclean, all which perish with the using.

35. A little view also of the multiplicity of these precepts, and the scrupulous observances required about them and their circumstances, will give light into that of another apostle, Acts xv. 10, calling the law "a yoke which neither their fathers nor themselves were able to bear." For although the weight of this yoke did principally consist in the matter of it, and the performance of duties required in it, yet it was greatly increased and aggravated by that multitude of commands wherein it consisted; whence our apostle

calls it "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," Eph. ii. 15, consisting of an endless number of commands, concerning which their minds could never attain any comfortable satisfaction whether they had answered their duty aright in them or no.

EXERCITATION XXI.

THE SANCTION OF THE LAW IN PROMISES AND THREATENINGS.

1. The sanction of the law in promises and threatenings—The law considered several ways; 2, 3. As the rule of the old covenant; 4. As having a new end put upon it; 5. As it was the instrument of the Jewish polity. 6. The sanction of it in the last of these senses. 7. Promises of three sorts, to be fulfilled by God himself. 8. Promises dependent on others—Parents, how they prolong the lives of their children. 9. Punishments threatened to be inflicted by God himself, and by others. 10. 11. Punishment בידי השמים, what. 12. Providential punishments—Partial—Total. 13. Persons intrusted with power of punishment. 14. The original distribution of the people—Taskmasters and officers in Egypt, who. 15. The authority of Moses. 16. The distribution of the people in the wilderness. 17. Institution of the sanhedrin, judges, kings. 18. Penalties ecclesiastical. 19. The three degrees of it explained and examined—Causes of *niddui*. 20, 21. Instance. John ix. 22. 22. Of *cherem;* and *shammatha*. 23–25. Form of an excommunication. 26. The sentence, Ezra x. 7, 8, explained. 27, 28. Civil penalties. 29, 30. Capital punishments—The several sorts of them.

1. By the *sanction of the law*, we intend the promises and penalties wherewith by God the observation of it and obedience unto it was enforced. This the apostle hath respect unto in sundry places of this Epistle; the principal whereof are reported in the following dissertation. To represent this distinctly, we may observe that the law falls under a threefold consideration;—first, As it was a repetition and expression of the *law of nature*, and the covenant of works established thereon; secondly, As it had a new *end* and design put upon the administration of it, to direct the church unto the use and benefit of the promise given of old to Adam, and renewed unto Abraham four hundred and thirty years before; thirdly, As it was the instrument of the rule and government of the church and people of Israel with respect unto the covenant made with them in and about the land of Canaan. And in this threefold respect it had a threefold sanction:—

2. First, As considered *absolutely*, it was attended with promises of life and threatenings of death, both eternal. The original promise of life upon obedience and the curse on its transgression were inseparably annexed unto it, yea, were essential parts of it, as it contained the covenant between God and man. See Gen. ii. 17; Deut.

xxvii. 26; Rom. vi. 23, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 6; Lev. xviii. 5; Ezek. xx. 11; Gal. iii. 12, 13.

3. Now, in the administration of the law, the church was thus far brought under the obligation of these promises and threatenings of life and death eternal, so far interested in the one and made obnoxious unto the other, as that if they used not the law according to the new dispensation of it, wherein it was put into a subserviency unto the promise, as Gal. iii. 19–24, they were left to stand or fall according to the absolute tenor of that first covenant and its ratification; which, by reason of the entrance of sin, proved fatally ruinous unto all that cleaved unto it, Rom. viii. 3, ix. 31.

4. Secondly, The law had, in this administration of it, a new end and design put upon it, and that in three things:—(1.) That it was made *directive* and instructive unto another end, and not merely preceptive, as at the beginning. The authoritative institutions that in it were superadded to the moral commands of the covenant of works, did all of them direct and teach the church to look for righteousness and salvation, the original ends of the first covenant, in another and by another way; as the apostle at large disputes in this Epistle, and declares positively, Gal. iii., throughout. (2.) In that it had a *dispensation* added unto the commands of obedience, and interpretation, *κατ' ἐπείκειαν*, by condescension, given by God himself, as to the perfection of its observance and manner of its performance in reference unto this new end. It required not absolutely *perfect obedience*, but *perfectness of heart*, integrity, and uprightness, in them that obeyed. And unto the law thus considered the former promises and threatenings were annexed; for the neglect of this use of it left the transgressors obnoxious to the curse denounced in general against them that continued not in the whole law to do it. (3.) It had *merciful relief* provided against sin, for the supportment and consolation of sinners, as we shall see in the consideration of their sacrifices.

5. Thirdly, It may be considered as it was the *instrument of the rule and government* of the people and church of Israel, according to the tenor of the covenant made with them about the land of Canaan, and their living unto God therein. And in this respect it had four things in it:—(1.) That it represented unto the people the *holiness* of God, the effects whereof are implanted in the law according to its original constitution; whereupon in it they are often called to be holy, because the Lord and Lawgiver is holy. (2.) That it gave a *representation of his grace* and condescension, pardoning sin in the covenant of mercy, inasmuch as he allowed a compensation by sacrifices for so many transgressions, which in their own nature were forfeitures of their interest in that land. (3.) That it was a *righteous rule of obedience* unto that people

as unto their especial covenant condition. (4.) That it fully represented the *severity* of God against wilful transgressors of his covenant, as now renewed in order to the promise, seeing every such transgression was attended, in their administration of rule, with death without mercy.

6. It is of the law under this third consideration,—though not absolutely as the instrument of the government of the people in Canaan, but as it had a representation in it of that administration of grace and mercy which was contained in the promises,—whereof we treat. Concerning this, or the law in this sense, we may consider first the promises, then the threatenings of it. And the promises are of two sorts;—first, Such as God took immediately upon himself the accomplishment of; secondly, Such as others, by his institution and appointment, were to communicate the benefit of unto the obedient.

7. The first are of three sorts:—First, Of *life temporal*, as it was an instrument of their government; and *eternal* with God, as the promise or covenant of grace was exemplified or represented therein, Lev. xviii. 5; Ezek. xx. 11; Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12. Secondly, Of a spiritual Redeemer, Saviour, Deliverer, really to *effect* what the ordinances of institution did *represent*, so to save them eternally, to be exhibited in the fulness of time, as we have at large already proved. Thirdly, There are given out with the law *various promises* of intervenient and mixed mercies, to be enjoyed in earthly things in this world, that had their immediate respect unto the mercy of the land of Canaan, representing spiritual grace, annexed to the then present administration of the covenant of grace. Some of these concerned the collation of good things, others the preventing of or delivery from evil; both expressed in great variety.

8. Of the promises whose accomplishment depended, by the institution of God, on others, that is the principal, and comprehensive of the rest, which is expressed, Exod. xx. 12, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long upon the land." This, saith our apostle, is "the first commandment with promise," Eph. vi. 2. Not that the foregoing precepts have no promises annexed to the observation of them, nor merely because this hath a promise literally expressed, but that it hath the special kind of promise, wherein parents, by God's institution, had power to prolong the lives of obedient children: יַאֲרִכֻן יָמֶיךָ, "They shall prolong thy days,"—that is, negatively, in not cutting off their life for disobedience, which was then in the power of natural parents; and positively, by praying for their prosperity, blessing them in the name of God, and directing them into the ways and means of universal obedience, whereby their days might be multiplied; and on sundry other accounts.

9. For the penalties annexed unto the transgression of the law, which our apostle principally hath respect unto in his discourses on

this subject, they will require a somewhat larger consideration. And they were of two sorts,—first, Such as God took upon himself to inflict; and, secondly, Such as he appointed others to see unto the execution of.

The FIRST are of four sorts:—

First, That *eternal punishment* which he threatened unto them that transgressed and disannulled his covenant, as renewed and ordered in the administration of the law and the ordinances thereof. This we have manifested elsewhere to be the importance of the curse which every such transgressor was obnoxious unto.

Secondly, The punishment which the Jews express by כרת and כריתות, "excision," or "cutting off." It is first mentioned Gen. xvii. 14, in the matter of circumcision; sometimes emphatically, Num. xv. 31, הִכָּרֵת תִּכָּרֵת, "Cutting off that soul shall be cut off from among his people;" and frequently afterwards, Exod. xii. 15, 19, xxxi. 14; Lev. xvii. 10, xx. 3, 5, 6. It is rendered by the apostle Peter, Ἐξολοθρευθήσεται, Acts iii. 23,—"Shall be destroyed from among the people;" that is, by the hand of God, as is declared 1 Cor. x. 10; Heb. xi. 28. Twenty-five times is this punishment threatened in the law,—still unto such sins as disannul the covenant; which our apostle respects, chap. ii. 2, 3, as shall be declared on that place.

10. Now, this punishment the Jews generally agree to be בידי השמים, "by the hand of Heaven," or that which God himself would immediately inflict; and it is evidently declared so to be in the interpretation given of it, Lev. xvii. 10, xx. 4–6.

But what this punishment was, or wherein it did consist, neither Jews nor Christians are absolutely agreed, the latter on this subject doing little more than representing the opinions and judgments of the other; which course also we may follow. Some of them say that untimely death is meant by it. So Abarbanel on Num. v. 22, קצור ימי החוטא ומיתתו קודם קצו בעלם הזה והוא עצמי ענין המיתה בידי שמים;—"It is the cutting off of the days of the sinner, and his death before the natural term of it, inflicted by the hand of Heaven." This untimely death they reckon to be between the years of twenty and sixty; whence Schindler, "כרת, 'exterminium,' cum quis præmaturâ morte, inter vigesimum et sexagesimum annum a Deo e medio tollitur, ita tamen ut relinquat liberos;"—"'Cutting off,' is when any one is taken away by untimely death, between the twentiêth and sixtieth year of his age, yet so as that he leave children." That clause or condition, "So that yet he leave posterity" (or "children") "behind him," is, as far as I can find, nowhere added by them, nor doth any thing in the Scripture give countenance thereunto; yea, many of the Hebrews think that this punishment consisted in this, that such an one should leave no children behind him, but that either he should be wholly ἄτεκνος, "without children," or if he had any before his

sin, they should all die before him, and so his name and posterity be cut off,—which, say they, is to be "cut off from among his people." So Aben Ezra on Gen. xvii. 14. And this opinion is not without its countenance from the Scripture itself. And therefore Jarchi, on the same place, with much probability, puts both these together: "He shall be cut off by untimely death, and leave no children behind him to continue his name or remembrance amongst the people." כמי שאין יש לו בנים חשוב כמת אבל מי שיש לו בנים כאילו הוא חי ושמו לא נכרת, as they speak;—"He that hath no children is accounted as dead; but he that hath, is as if he lived, and his name is not cut off."

11. They have a third opinion also,—that by this "cutting off" the soul is intended, especially when the word is ingeminated: "Cutting off he shall be cut off," as Num. xv. 31. So Maimonides, שתאבד הנפש ולא תהיה חיה וקיימת;—"That soul shall perish; it shall not live" (or "subsist") "any more for ever." Few embrace this opinion, as being contrary to their general persuasion of eternal punishments for the transgressions of the covenant. Wherefore it is disputed against by Abarbanel on Num. xv., who contends that the death of the soul, in everlasting separation from God, is not intended in this threatening. And both the principal parts of these various opinions, namely, that of immature corporeal death and eternal punishment, are joined together by Jonathan in his Targum on Num. xv. 31: "He shall be cut off in this world, and that man shall be cut off in the world to come, and bear his sin in the day of judgment." For my part, as I have showed that eternal death was contained in the curse of the law, so this especial כרת, or "extermination" from among the people, seems to me to intend some especial judgment of God in taking away the life of such a person; answering unto that putting to death by the judges and magistrates in such cases, when they were known, which God did appoint. And herein, also, was an eminent representation of the everlasting cutting off of obstinate and final transgressors of the covenant.

12. Thirdly, In *judgments* to be brought providentially upon the whole nation, by pestilence, famine, sword, and captivity; which are at large declared, Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.

Fourthly, *Total rejection* of the whole body of the people, in case of unbelief and disobedience, upon the full and perfect revelation that was to be made of the will and mind of God upon the coming of the Messiah, Deut. xviii. 15; Acts iii. 23; Hosea ii. 23; Isa. x. 22, 23; Rom. ix.

These are the heads of the punishments which God took upon himself to inflict in an extraordinary manner on the transgressors of the law; that is, those who proceeded to do it with so high an hand as that his covenant was made void thereby, as to all the ends of its re-establishment in the administration of the law.

13. The SECOND sort of penalties annexed unto the transgression of the law were such as men, by God's institution and appointment, were enabled to inflict: concerning which we must consider, first, who and what the persons were who were enabled and authorized to inflict these penalties; secondly, of what sort these penalties were, and for what transgressions necessarily inflicted.

14. The original division of the people, after the days of Jacob, was, first, into שְׁבָטִים, "tribes;" whereof at first there were twelve, which, by dividing the tribe of Joseph into two, were increased unto thirteen, and upon the matter reduced again unto twelve by the special exclusion of the tribe of Levi from inheritances, and their separation to the worship of God. Secondly, מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, "families," or בָּתֵּי אָבוֹת, "houses of fathers;" which, on many probabilities, may be supposed to have been seventy, the number of them who went down with Jacob into Egypt, each of which constituted a particular family. And, thirdly, בָּתִּים, particular "households;" all which are enumerated, Josh. vii. 14. This distribution continued amongst the people whilst they were in Egypt, and this only, they being not capable to cast themselves into any civil order there by reason of their oppressions, and therefore they contented themselves with that which was natural. Accordingly, there were three sorts of persons that were in some kind of dignity and pre-eminence among the people, although it may be after their oppression began they were hindered from exercising the authority that belonged unto them. First, As to the tribes, there were some who were נְשִׂיאֵי רָאשֵׁי מַטּוֹת, "the princes" (or "heads") "of the tribes," Num. i. 16, twelve in number, according to the number of the tribes. Secondly, For the families or principal houses of the fathers, there were הַזְּקֵנִים, "the elders," who presided over them. These Moses and Aaron gathered together at their first coming into Egypt, Exod. iv. 29. And these, as I said before, being the rulers of the first families, were probably in number seventy, from whence afterwards was the constitution of seventy elders for rule, Exod. xxiv. 1. Thirdly, כֹּהֲנִים, or "priests," it may be in every private household the first-born, which are mentioned and so called before the constitution of the Aaronical priesthood, Exod. xix. 22. Besides these, there were officers who attended the service of the whole people as to the execution of justice and order, called שֹׁטְרִים, "shoterim," which we have rendered by the general name of "officers," Exod. v. 14. And they are afterwards distinguished from the elders and judges, Deut. xvi. 18; for there are two sorts of persons mentioned that were over the people in respect of their works, even in Egypt, הַנֹּגְשִׂים and שֹׁטְרִים, "exactors," or taskmasters, and "officers," Exod. v. 6. The former, or "the noghesim," the Jews say, were Egyptians; and the latter, or "the shoterim," Israelites;" which occasions that distinct expression of them, "Pharaoh commanded the

same day the taskmasters of the people and their officers;" and verses 13, 14, "And the taskmasters hasted them, saying, Fulfil your works; . . . . . and the officers of the children of Israel were beaten." And they tell us in Midrash Rabba, on Exod. sect. 1, that one of these noghesim was over ten of the Israelitish officers, and one of them over ten Israelites; whence was the following division of the people into tens and hundreds. And unto this, in the same place, they add a putid story of an exactor killed by Moses.

15. What was the authority of these, and how it was executed by them in Egypt, nothing is recorded. Probably, at the beginning of their works and afflictions, they were made use of only to answer for the pretended neglects or miscarriages of the multitude of their brethren, as Exod. v. 14.

After their coming up out of Egypt, during their abode in the wilderness, Moses presided over them with all manner of authority, as their lawgiver, king, and judge. He judged and determined all their causes, as is frequently affirmed, and that alone, until, by the advice of Jethro, he took in others unto his assistance, Exod. xviii. 13–26. And there is mention of four particular cases that he determined,—one *religious*, one *civil*, and two *capital*, relating to religion. In these he made especial inquiry of God. The first was about the *unclean* that would keep the passover, Num. ix. 7, 8; the second, about the *daughters of Zelophehad*, who claimed their father's inheritance, Num. xxvii. 1–5; the third, about the *blasphemer*, Lev. xxiv. 10–12; the last, about him that *profaned the Sabbath*, Num. xv. 32–34;—in which also, as the Jews say, he set a pattern to future judges, as determining the lesser causes speedily, but those wherein blood was concerned not without stay and much deliberation.

16. In the wilderness the body of the people was cast into a new distribution, of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens; all which had their peculiar officers or rulers chosen from amongst themselves, Exod. xviii. 25; Deut. i. 13–15. And Moses is said to choose them, because, being chosen by the people, he approved of them, as the places foregoing compared do manifest. The principal distributions of these, planting themselves together in the cities or towns of Canaan, however afterward they multiplied or were decreased, continued to be called by the names of the "thousands of Israel" or Judah. So Bethlehem Ephratah is said to be "little among the thousands of Judah," Micah v. 2. One of those thousands, that had their especial head and ruler over them, and their distinct government, as to their own concernments, among themselves, sat down at Bethlehem; which colony afterwards variously flourished or drew towards a decay.

17. After these things, by God's appointment, was constituted the great court of the sanhedrin; which because we have treated of

apart elsewhere, with those lesser courts of justice which were instituted in imitation of it, sufficiently to our purpose, I shall here wholly omit. Neither shall I need to mention their judges, raised up extraordinarily of God for the general rule of the whole people; nor their kings, continued by succession in the family of David; because their story in general is sufficiently known, and the especial consideration of their power, with the manner of the administration of it, would draw us too far out of the way of our present design. And these are they unto whom the Lord, in their several generations, committed the execution of those punishments that he had allotted unto the transgression of the law.

18. The penalties themselves, with the especial causes of them, are lastly to be considered. And these in general were of two sorts; —first, ecclesiastical; secondly, civil. Ecclesiastical penalties, were the authoritative *exclusion* of an offending person from the society of the church and the members of it. That such an exclusion is prescribed in the law, in sundry cases, hath in several instances been by others evidenced. Many disputes also have been about it, both concerning the causes of it, the authority whereby it was done, with its ends and effects; but these things are not of our present consideration, who intend only to represent things as they are *in facto* instituted or observed.

19. Of this exclusion the Jews commonly make three degrees, and that not without some countenance from the Scripture. The first they call נדוי, "niddui;" the second חרם, "cherem;" and the third שמתא, "shammatha." That which they call niddui, from נדה, "to expel, to separate, to cast off," is with the most of them the first and lowest degree of this separation and exclusion. And the persons who are to pronounce this sentence and put it into execution are, according to the Jews, any court, from the highest or sanhedrin of seventy-one at Jerusalem, to the meanest of their synagogues; yea, any ruler of a synagogue, or wise man in authority, might, according unto them, do the same thing. And many ridiculous stories they have, about the mutual excommunication and absolution of one another by consent. The time of its continuance, or the first space of time given to the person offending to repent, was thirty days; to which on his neglect he was left unto sixty, and then to ninety; when, upon his obstinacy, he was obnoxious to the cherem. As the causes of it, they reckon up, in the Jerusalem Talmud, Moed Katon, twenty-four crimes, on the guilt whereof any one may be thus dealt withal: 1. He that despiseth a wise man,—that is, a rabbi, master, or doctor,—even after his death. 2. He that contemneth a minister or messenger of the house of judgment. 3. He that calleth his neighbour "servant" or "slave." 4. He to whom the judge sends and appoints a time of appearance, and he doth

not appear. 5. He that despiseth the words of the scribes, much more the words of the law of Moses. 6. He that doth not obey and stand unto the sentence denounced against him. 7. He that hath any hurtful thing in his power, as a biting dog, and doth not remove it. 8. He that sells his field to a Christian or any heathen. 9. He that gives witness against an Israelite in the courts of the Christians. 10. A priest that killeth cattle, and doth not separate the gifts that belong to another priest. 11 He that profaneth the second holy day in captivity. 12. He that doth any work in the afternoon before the passover. 13. He that taketh the name of God in vain on any account. 14. He that induceth others to profane the name of God. 15. He that draweth others to eat of holy things without the temple. 16. He that computes the times, or writes calendars or almanacs, fixing the months, out of the land of Israel. 17. He that causeth a blind man to fall. 18. He that hindereth others from doing the work of the law. 19. He that makes profane the killing of any creature by his own fault. 20. He that killeth and doth not show his knife beforehand before a wise man, whereby it may appear to be fit. 21. He that is unwilling to or makes himself difficult in learning. 22. He that putteth away his wife, and afterwards hath commerce with her in buying and selling, which may induce them to cohabitation. 23. A wise man of evil fame and report. 24. He that excommunicateth him who deserveth not that sentence.

20. An instance of this exclusion we have expressly in the gospel: John ix. 22, "The Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται,"—"he should be put out of the synagogue." He should be מנודה, "menuddeh,"—put under the sentence of niddui. And according to this sentence they proceeded with the blind man whose eyes were opened by the Lord Christ: Verse 34, Ἐξέβαλον,—that is, saith the margin of our translation, "they excommunicated him." But that is not the signification of the word; it denotes only their causing him to be thrust out of the synagogue by their officers; although there is no doubt but that at the same time they pronounced sentence against him.

21. If a man died under this sentence, they laid a stone upon his bier, intimating that he deserved lapidation if he had lived. Howbeit, they excluded him not from teaching or learning of the law, so that he kept four paces distant from other persons. He came in and went out of the temple at the contrary door to others, that he might be known. All which, with sundry other things, were of their traditional additions to the just prescriptions of the word.

22. In case this process succeeded not, and upon some greater

demerits, the sentence of חרם, "cherem," was to be proceeded unto.

This is an high degree of authoritative separation from the congregation, and is made use of either when the former is despised, or, as was said, upon greater provocations. This sentence must not be denounced but in a congregation of ten at least; and with such an one that is מנודה, thus anathematized, it is not lawful so much as to eat.

The third and last sentence in this kind, which contains a total and irrecoverable exclusion of a person from the communion of the congregation, is called שמתא, "shammatha." Some of the Talmudical rabbins, in Moed Katon, give the etymology of this word as if it should be as much as שם מיתה, "sham metha," death is there. But it is generally agreed that it is from שמת, "to exclude, expel, cast out;" that is, from the covenant of promise and commonwealth of Israel. And this the most take to be total and final, the persons that fall under it being left to the judgment of God, without hope of reconciliation unto the church. Hence it is called in the Targum, Num. xxi. 25, Deut. vii. 26, "The curse, the execration of God;" and by the Talmudists, שמתא דאלהי ישראל,—"The anathema of the God of Israel." But yet it cannot be denied but that in many places they speak of it as the general name for *any excommunication*, and so as not at all to difference it from niddui, which is taken to be the least degree thereof. The most learned Buxtorf hath given us, out of an ancient Hebrew manuscript, a form of this excommunication, which is truly *ferale carmen*, as sad and dismal an imprecation as, according to their principles, could well be invented. It is, indeed, by him applied unto the cherem; but as l'Empereur hath observed, in his annotations on Bertram, it was doubtless only made use of in the last and greatest exclusion, which is supposed to be the shammatha. The form of the curse is as ensues:—

23. "By the sentence of the Lord of lords, let such a one, the son of such a one" (פלני בן פלני), "be in anathema, or be accursed in each house of judgment, that above and that below" (that is, by God and his church); "in the curse of the holy ones on high; in the curse of the seraphim and ophannim" (the wheels or cherubim in Ezekiel's vision); "in the curse of the whole church, from the greatest to the least. Let there be upon him strokes great and abiding, diseases great and horrible. Let his house be an habitation of dragons," (תנים, or "serpents.") "Let his star" (or "planet") "be dark in the clouds. Let him be exposed to indignation, anger, and wrath; and let his dead body be cast to wild beasts and serpents. Let his enemies and adversaries rejoice over him; and let his silver and gold be given to others; and let all his children be cast at the

doors of his adversaries; and let posterity be astonished at his day. Let him be accursed out of the mouth of Addiriron and Athariel, from the mouth of Sandalphon and Hadraniel, from the mouth of Ansisiel and Pathiel, from the mouth of Seraphiel and Sagansael, from the mouth of Michael and Gabriel, from the mouth of Raphiel and Mesharethiel. Let him be accursed from the mouth of Zazabib, and from the mouth of Havabib, who is the great God; and from the mouth of the seventy names of the great King; and from the mouth of Tzorlak the great chancellor." (These names, partly significant and partly insignificant, coined to strike a terror into the minds of weak and distempered persons, they invent and apply at their pleasure to angels, good and bad; not unlike the monstrous names which the Gnostics gave to the Æons,—who borrowed many things from the tradition of the Jews, and returned them again unto them with an improvement. But they proceed.) "Let him be swallowed up, as Korah and his company; and let his soul depart with fear and terror. Let the rebuke of the Lord slay him, and let him be strangled like Ahithophel. Let his leprosy be as the leprosy of Gehazi, neither let there be any restoration of his ruin. Let not his burial be in the burials of Israel. Let his wife be given to strangers, and let others humble her at his death. Under this curse let such a one, the son of such a one, be, with his whole inheritance. But unto me and all Israel let God extend his peace and blessing. Amen."

24. Now, because it is certain that this is a form of the greatest and last anathema, of a final and total excommunication, and yet he who is devoted is everywhere said to be מוחרם, "muchram," and under the cherem, it is almost evident that these three degrees are not distinguished, as is commonly supposed,—namely, that the shammatha should exceed the cherem, and that only the niddui, the highest and extremest sentence in this solemn form being so often called the cherem. Shammatha, therefore, is only a general name for the expulsion of a person, sometimes with the niddui, and sometimes with the cherem; which yet I do not suppose was always thus horrid and fierce.

25. To add unto the terror of this sentence, they used to accompany the pronouncing of it with the sound of trumpets and horns, as the Targum says Barak did in his cursing of Meroz, Judges v. 23, "He shammathised him with four hundred trumpets." And herein have they been imitated by the church of Rome, in their shaking of candles, and ringing of bells, on the like occasion.

I have not reported these things as though, for matter and manner, they wholly belonged unto the penalties of the law that were of divine institution. Many things in the manner of their performance, as they are now expressed by the rabbins, were certainly of their own

arbitrary invention. When their use amongst them first began is unknown, though it be not improbable that sundry things of this nature were practised by them before the destruction of the second temple, when they had mixed many of their own superstitions with the worship of God, as is evident from the gospel.

26. But this also is certain, that God in sundry cases had appointed that some transgressors should be separated from the congregation, devoted to destruction, and cut off; an instance of the execution of which institution we have, Ezra x. 7, 8, "They made proclamation throughout Judah and Jerusalem unto all the children of the captivity, that they should gather themselves together unto Jerusalem; and that whosoever would not come within three days, according to the counsel of the princes and the elders, all his substance should be devoted, and himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away." A double penalty is here threatened upon disobedient persons. The one concerned the person of such an one: הוּא יִבָּדֵל מִקְּהַל הַגּוֹלָה;—"He shall be separated from the congregation of the captivity;" that is, of Israel then returned out of captivity. And this was the niddui, or expulsion from sacred communion, which we before described: he should be esteemed as an heathen. Secondly, As to his substance, יָחֳרַם כָּל־רְכוּשׁוֹ,—"All his substance (his goods and possessions) should be anathematized," —devoted, put under cherem, taken away for sacred uses. Hence some have made this distinction between the three degrees of excommunication:—First, the niddui concerned only the *person*, and his separation from sacred offices; cherem had also confiscation of *goods* attending it, the substance of the transgressor being devoted; and shammatha was accompanied with the *death* of the devoted person;—which carnal penalties being removed under the gospel, that great and sore revenge which disobedient sinners are to expect from the hand of God at the last day is substituted by our apostle in the room of them all, Heb. x. 28, 29.

27. Civil penalties next succeed, and they were of three sorts; —first, *Corporeal*; secondly, Such as respected the *outward estate* and condition of the offender; thirdly, *Capital.*

First, *Corporeal punishment* was that only of stripes, not exceeding the number of forty, Deut. xxv. 2, 3. An account of the Jews' opinions, and the manner of their execution of this punishment, is given us by many, in particular exactly by Buxtorf in his preface unto his Bibliotheca Rabbinica, whither I refer the reader. They call it מלקות, or "beating by strokes," and sometimes מלקות ארבעים, "the beating of forty," or with forty; and he that was liable unto it was בן הכאות, "filius plagarum." Many crimes, doubtless, rendered persons obnoxious to this penalty, but they are not directly expressed in the law. The Jews now reckon up seven instances of

unlawful copulation with women, free and unmarried; for adultery, as is known, was capital by the express sentence of the law: as,—1. With a sister; 2. A father's sister; 3. A mother's sister; 4. A wife's sister; 5. A brother's widow; 6. An uncle's widow; 7. A woman separated. Many other crimes also they reckon up with reference unto ceremonial institutions, as eating of fat, and blood, and leaven on the passover, making an oil like the holy oil, even all such transgressions as are threatened with punishment, but have no express kind of punishment annexed unto them.

28. Secondly, Punishments respecting *state and condition* were of two sorts;—1. Pecuniary, in a quadruple restitution in case of theft; 2. Personal, in banishment, or confinement unto the city of refuge for him that had slain a man at unawares, Num. xxxv. 25.

29. Thirdly, *Capital punishments* they inflicted four ways:—1. By strangulation, Deut. xxi. 22; which was inflicted on six sorts of transgressors:—(1.) Adulterers; (2.) Strikers of parents; (3.) Man-stealers; (4) Old men exemplarily rebellious against the law; (5.) False prophets; (6.) Prognosticators by the names of idols. 2. Burning, Lev. xx. 14; and this, the Jews say, was inflicted by pouring molten lead into their mouths. And the crimes that this punishment was allotted to were,—(1.) The adultery of the priest's daughter. (2.) Incest,—[1.] With a daughter; [2.] With a son's daughter; [3.] A wife's daughter; [4.] A wife's daughter's daughter; [5.] A wife's son's daughter; [6.] A wife's mother; [7.] The mother of her father; [8.] The mother of her father-in-law. 3. Death was inflicted by the sword, Exod. xxxii. 27,—(1.) On the voluntary manslayer; (2.) On the inhabitants of any city that fell to idolatry. 4. By stoning, Deut. xxi. 21, which was executed for incest,—(1.) With a mother; (2.) A mother-in-law; (3.) A daughter-in-law; (4.) Adultery with a betrothed virgin; (5.) Unnatural uncleanness with men; (6.) With beasts by men; (7.) With beasts by women; (8.) Blasphemy; (9.) Idolatry; (10.) Offering to Moloch; (11.) A familiar spirit of Ob; (12.) Of Jideoni; (13.) On impostors; (14.) On seducers; (15.) On enchanters or magicians; (16.) Profaners of the Sabbath; (17.) Cursers of fathers or mothers; (18.) The dissolute and stubborn son;—concerning all which it is expressly said that they shall be stoned.

30. Unto the execution of these penalties there were added two *cautionary laws;*—first, That they that were put to death, for the increase of their ignominy and terror of others, should be hanged on a tree, Deut. xxi. 22; secondly, That they should be buried the same day, verse 23. And this is a brief abstract of the penalties of the law, as it was the rule of the polity of the people in the land of Canaan.

EXERCITATION XXII.

OF THE TABERNACLE AND ARK.

1. The building of the tabernacle. 2, 3. Moses' writing and reading the book of the covenant. 4. Considerations of the particulars of the fabric and utensils of the tabernacle omitted. 5. One instance insisted on: the ark —The same in the tabernacle and temple—The glory of God, in what sense. 6. The principal sacred utensil. 7. The matter whereof it was made. 8, 9. The form of it. 10. The end and use of it. 11. The residence and motions of it. 12. The mercy-seat that was upon it. 13. The matter thereof. 14, 15. Of the cherubim—Their form and fashion. 16, 17. The visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel compared—Difference in them, and reason thereof. 18. Two other cherubim also in the temple. 19. The knowledge of God enjoyed under the gospel superior to the typical representations of him under the old dispensation.

1. THE people having received the law in the wilderness, and therein a foundation being laid of their future church-state and worship, which was to continue "until the time of reformation," Heb. ix. 10, they had also, by God's direction, a place and building for the seat of that worship assigned unto them. This was the *tabernacle* erected in the wilderness, suited to their then moving state and condition; into the room whereof the temple built afterwards by Solomon succeeded, when they had attained a fixed station in the land of promise. Our apostle respecting the ordinances of that church as first instituted by Moses,—which the Hebrews boasted of as their privilege, and on the account whereof they obstinately adhered unto their observation,—insists only on the tabernacle, whereunto the temple and its services were referred and conformed. And this he doth principally, chap. ix. 1–5, "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat."

2. The preparation for the directions which God gave for the building of this tabernacle is declared, Exod. xxiv. The body of the people having heard the law,—that is, the ten words or commandments,—which was all they heard, Deut. ix. 10 (what God spake to them was written in the two tables of stone), they removed unto a greater distance from the mount, Exod. xx. 18. After their removal, Moses continued to receive from the Lord that summary of the whole law which is expressed, chap. xxi., xxii., xxiii. And

all this, as it should seem, at the first hearing, he wrote in a book from the mouth of God: for it is said, chap. xxiv. 4, that he "wrote all the words of the LORD;" and, verse 7, that "he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people."

3. The Jewish masters suppose that it was the book of Genesis that is there intended; for, say they, the rest of the law was not yet written, namely, before God himself had written or engraven the ten words on the two tables of stone. But this is a fond imagination, seeing the book which Moses read contained the form and tenor of the covenant made with that people at Horeb, and is expressly so called, and as such was then solemnly confirmed and ratified by sacrifice. It may therefore be supposed that there is a prolepsis used in the recording of this story, and that, indeed, the confirmation of the covenant by sacrifice, which was accompanied with the reading of the book, was not until after the third return of Moses from the mount with the renewed tables. But this also may well be doubted, seeing this sacrifice was prepared and offered by the "young men of the children of Israel," verse 5; that is, the first-born, whose office was superseded upon the separation of Aaron and his sons unto the priesthood, which God had designed before that last descent of Moses from the mount. We must therefore leave things in the order wherein they are set down and recorded. It appears, therefore, that Moses wrote the law as he received it from God. This being done, he came down and read it in the ears of the people; and he proposed it unto them, as containing the terms of the covenant that God would have them enter into. This they solemnly engaged to the performance of, and thereby had their admission into a new church-state. This being done, the whole was confirmed by sacrifice and the sprinkling of blood, to prefigure the great confirmation of the new covenant by the blood of Christ, as we shall see afterwards.

4. Things being thus settled, Moses goes up again into the mount, to receive directions for that worship of God which he appointed and enjoined unto them in that church-state whereinto they were newly admitted. And here, in the first place, the Lord instructs him in the frame and whole fabric of the tabernacle, as that which was an eminent type of the human nature of Christ, and so indispensably necessary unto the solemn worship then ordained as that no part of it could be rightly performed but with respect thereunto. This, therefore, with all the parts and utensils of it, should now come under consideration. But there are sundry reasons for which I shall omit it in this place; as,—(1.) The most material things belonging unto it must necessarily be considered in our exposition of those places in our apostle where they are expressly insisted on (2.) Many things relating unto it, as the measures of it, some part of

the matter whereof it was made, divers colours used about it, are very dubious, and some of them so absolutely uncertain that the Jews themselves can come to no agreement about them; and it is not meet to enter into the discussion of such things without more room and liberty than our present design will allow unto us. (3.) Many learned men have already travailed with great diligence and skill in the discovery of all the several concernments of the tabernacle and temple; from whom the reader may receive much satisfaction who hath a mind to inquire into these things. Add unto all this, that the writing of this part of these discourses is fallen upon such a season as affords me very little encouragement or assistance to enlarge upon it. Only, that the reader may not go away without a taste in one instance of what he might have expected in the whole, I shall choose out one particular utensil of the tabernacle, and give an account of it unto him; and this shall be the ark and its attendancies.

5. The ark was the only furniture of the most holy place, the most sacred and holy of all the utensils of the tabernacle and temple. And it was the same in them both, as is evident, 1 Kings viii. 4–6. It was the repository of the covenant,—for so the law, written by the finger of God in tables of stone, is often called metonymically,—and being anointed, Exod. xl. 10, became קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "holiness of holinesses," or most holy; a type of Him who was to fulfil the law and establish the covenant between God and man, being thereunto anointed as the Most Holy, Dan. ix. 24. It was also the great pledge of the presence of God in the church; whence it is not only sometimes called his "glory," Ps. lxxviii. 61, "He gave תִּפְאַרְתּוֹ," "his glory," beauty, majesty, "into the hand of the enemy," when the ark was taken,—whereon the wife of Phinehas cried, אִי כָבוֹד, "Where is the glory?" 1 Sam. iv. 21, because therein the glory departed from Israel, verse 22,—but in its presence also glory was said to "dwell in the land," Ps. lxxxv. 10, לִשְׁכֹּן כָּבוֹד, because therein the Shechinah or Chabod, or glorious presence of God, dwelt and abode among his people; yea, it hath the name of God himself attributed to it, by reason of its representation of his majesty, Ps. xxiv. 7, 9, 10.

We call it by the same name with the great vessel wherein Noah and the seed of all living creatures were preserved; but their names are far distant in the original, both in sound and signification. This was אָרוֹן, "aaron," a chest, it may be from אֹרֶן, a certain wood whereof such chests were made; that was תֵּבָה, "tebah," the name of any vessel in the water, great or small, though made with bulrushes, Exod. ii. 3.

6. It was, as the principal, so the first utensil of the tabernacle that God appointed to be made, Exod. xxv. 10; and therein it was as

the heart, from which, by a communication of sacred holiness from the presence of God, all other things belonging unto the worship of the whole were spirited and as it were enlivened. And immediately upon its entrance into the temple, the visible pledge of the presence of God therein appeared to all, and not before, 1 Kings viii 6, 10, 11.

7. The matter whereof it was made was עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים, Exod. xxv. 10, "shittim wood," or boards of the שִׁטָּה tree, mentioned Isa. xli. 19. What wood it was is altogether uncertain, although it seems sure enough to have been none that grew in the wilderness, where the people were at the erection of the tabernacle: for these shittim boards were reckoned amongst the stores of silver and brass, and such other things as they had brought with them into the wilderness, Exod. xxxv. 24; and that expression, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר נִמְצָא אִתּוֹ, "Every one with whom was found shittim wood," intimates the rarity of it, and that, it may be, it had been preserved by them for sundry generations. There is, indeed, a place called Shittim, and Abel-shittim, mentioned Num. xxv. 1, and chap. xxxiii. 49, but not probably from these trees. However, it was in the plains of Moab, whereunto the Israelites came not until forty years after the making of the ark. Further, then, we know nothing of the shittim tree, or of this wood; for whatever is discoursed of it, as it hath been discoursed by many, is mere conjecture, ending in professed uncertainty. Only, it seems to have been notable for firmness and duration, as continuing in the ark apparently nine hundred years, even from the making of it unto the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans; and, it may be, it was returned to the second temple, not perishing absolutely until the covenant with that people expired six hundred years after the captivity. But herein it had the advantage of preservation from all external causes of putrefaction, by its enclosure on all parts in a covering of gold.

8. The form of the ark was of a long square chest, of small dimensions, two cubits and an half in length, one and an half in breadth, and so in height also, Exod. xxv. 10,—that is, according to the most approved estimation of these measures, near four feet long, and two feet and some inches broad and high; and further exactness or accuracy about these measures is of little certainty and less use. How the boards of it were joined is not mentioned. Overlaid it was with pure gold, beaten gold, pure and unmixed, מִבַּיִת וּמִחוּץ, "intus et extra, undequaque," on all the boards of it, both within and without, so that no part of the wood was anywhere to be seen or touched. Round about it,—that is, on the edge of the sides upwards,—it had (עָלָיו סָבִיב, "upon it," round about) זֵר, "a diadem," or a fringe of gold-work, such as encompassed diadems or crowns. And this זֵר, or "diadem," was put only on the ark, the table of shew-bread, and the altar of incense; intending expressions of rays of gold, as coming

from זָרָה, "to scatter abroad" in the manner of rays and beams; which, Heb. i. 3, is called ἀπαύγασμα, the "brightness" of glory. And hence the rabbins speak of a threefold crown, of the *ark, altar*, and *table;*—of the last for the king; of the midst for the priest; of the first for they know not whom, as Rabbi Solomon expressly;—indeed, all representing the threefold office of Christ, for whom the crowns were laid up, Zech. vi. 11, 14.

9. At the four corners, on the outside, were annexed unto it four rings of gold, on each side two. Through these rings went two staves or bars, wherewith the ark was to be carried on the shoulders of the Levites, Exod. xxv. 12–15; for the neglect of which service, strictly enjoined them, Num. vii. 9, God made a breach on Uzzah in the days of David, 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7.

10. The end wherefore God appointed the making of this ark, was to put therein הָעֵדֻת, "the testimony," Exod. xxv. 16; that is, the two tables of stone engraved on both sides with the ten commandments, pronounced by the ministry of angels, and written with the finger of God. Besides this there was in it nothing at all, as is expressly affirmed, 1 Kings viii. 9; 2 Chron. v. 10; Deut. x. 2, 5. The appearance of a dissent from hence in an expression of our apostle, Heb. ix. 4, shall be considered in its proper place.

11. This ark made at Horeb, 1 Kings viii. 9,—that is, at the foot of the mountain where the people encamped,—was finished with the rest of the tabernacle on the first day of the first month of the second year of the coming of the Israelites out of Egypt, Exod. xl. 1–3, being, as we have showed, the visible pledge of the presence of God amongst them, as it was placed with its tabernacle in the midst of the people whilst they were encamped in the wilderness,—the body of them being distributed into four hosts to the four quarters of heaven, Num. ii., that a blessing from thence might be equally communicated unto them all, and all might have an alike access to the worship of God,—so it was carried in their marching in the midst of their armies, with a pronunciation of a solemn benediction when it began to set forward, and when it returned unto its repository in the most holy place, Num. x. 35, 36. This was the ordinary course in the removals of the ark. In an extraordinary manner God appointed it to be carried before all the people when the waters of Jordan were divided by his power, whereor that was a pledge, Josh. iii. 14–16; which the people on their own heads going afterwards to imitate, in their war with the Philistines, received a sad reward of their temerity and boldness, 1 Sam. iv.

From the wilderness the ark was carried to Gilgal, Josh. v. 10; and thence removed with the tabernacle to Shiloh, Josh. xviii. 1. Some suppose that after this it was occasionally removed to Mizpeh, as Judges xi. 11, xx. 1, xxi. 1, 2; because it is said in those places that

such things were done "before the LORD in Mizpeh." But that expression doth not necessarily infer the presence of the ark and sanctuary in that place; yea, the context seems to intimate that it was at another place distant from thence, as, chap. xx. 26, 27, they went up from the place of the assembly in Mizpeh to the house of God, where the ark was. In Shechem also it is supposed to have been, from the assembly that Joshua made there, chap. xxiv. 1; upon the close whereof he fixed a stone of memorial before the sanctuary, verse 26. But yet neither doth this evince the removal of the ark or sanctuary; for Shechem being not far from Shiloh, the people might meet in the town for convenience, and then go some of them with Joshua unto Shiloh, as is most probable that they did. From Shiloh it was carried into the field of Aphek, against the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv.; and being taken by them, was carried first to Ashdod, then to Gath, then to Ekron, 1 Sam. v.; thence returned to Kirjath-jearim, 1 Sam. vi., to the house of Abinadab, 1 Sam. vii.; thence to the house of Obed-edom, 2 Sam. vi.; thence to Mount Zion in Jerusalem, into a place prepared for it by David, 2 Sam. vi.; and from thence it was solemnly introduced into and enthroned in the most holy place of the temple built by Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 6, 7. In the meantime, either occasionally or by advice, the tabernacle was removed from Shiloh, and that first place of the solemn worship of God altogether deserted, and made an example of what God would afterwards do unto the temple when his worship therein also was neglected and defiled, Jer. vii. 12–14, xxvi. 6, 9. In the temple of Solomon it continued either unto the captivity of Jehoiakim, when Nebuchadnezzar took away all "the goodly vessels of the house of the LORD," 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, or unto the captivity of Zedekiah, when he carried away all the remaining vessels, "great and small," verse 18. Of the Talmudical fable concerning the hiding of it by Josiah or Jeremiah, with the addition of its supposed restoration at the last day, in the second book of Maccabees, I have spoken elsewhere. Whether it was returned again with the vessels of the house of the Lord, by Cyrus, is uncertain. If it was not, it was an intimation that the covenant made with that people was waxing old, and hasting unto an expiration.

12. The things that accompanied this ark in the most holy place were upon it the *mercy-seat*, on the ends of it two *cherubim*. The mercy-seat, as to its making, form, use, and disposition, is declared, Exod. xxv. 17. It is called כַּפֹּרֶת, "capporeth." כָּפַר signifies "to hide, to cover, to plaster over, to shut, to plaster with bitumen or pitch;" in Pihel, "to expiate sin," Exod. xxx. 10, Lev. iv. 20. If the name "mercy-seat" be taken from the word in Kal, it signifies only "operimentum, tegumentum, tegmen," "a covering," and so ought to be rendered. If it be taken from the sense of the word

in Pihel, it retains the signification of expiation, and consequently of pardon and mercy. So it is by our translators rendered "mercy-seat," and that with respect unto the rendering of it by the apostle, ἱλαστήριον, Heb. ix. 5, as by the LXX. in this place, ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθετον, the "propitiatory placed on the ark;" wherein what respect was had to the Lord Christ the apostle declares, Rom. iii. 25, and largely in our Epistle, chap. ix.

13. Its matter was of pure gold; and for its dimensions, it was just as broad and long as the ark whereon it was laid, Exod. xxv. 21. And this mercy-seat or covering of gold seems to have lain upon the ark within the verge of gold or crown that encompassed it, being itself plain, without any such verge or crown; for it was placed עַל־הָאָרֹן, מִלְּמַעְלָה, "upon the ark," just over it, verse 21, and so was encompassed with its crown,—the glory both of justice and mercy, of law and gospel, being the same in Christ Jesus.

14. At the two ends of this mercy-seat were placed two cherubim, one at the one end, the other at the other, both of gold, and, as it should seem, of one continued work with the covering itself. The name of "cherubim" hath prevailed for these figures or images from the Hebrew; partly because it is retained by our apostle, who calls them "cherubim of glory," χερουβίμ δόξης, Heb. ix. 5; and partly because the signification of the word being not well known, it cannot properly be otherwise expressed,—for which reason it was retained also by the LXX. They were of those things which our apostle, chap. ix. 23, terms ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, "examples,"—expressions, or similitudes, "of things in heaven;" whose framing and erection, in reference unto the worship of God, is forbidden under the name of כָּל־תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם, Exod. xx. 4,—"The likeness of any thing in heaven above." The first mention of cherubim is Gen. iii. 24, "God placed cherubim;" which seems to intimate that the prototypes of these figures were heavenly ministers or angels, though Aben Ezra supposes that the word denotes any erected figures or appearances whatever. Others of the Jews, as Kimchi, think the word to be compounded of כ, "caph," a note of similitude, and רביא, "a child," to signify "like a child," being so called from their form or shape. But this answers not unto the description given afterwards of them in Ezekiel; much less with the same appellation given to the winds and clouds, Ps. xviii. 10. The word hath a great affinity with רְכוּב, "a chariot." So are the angels of God called his "chariots," Ps. lxviii. 17; and David so calls expressly the cherubim that were to be made in Solomon's temple, 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, "Gold for the pattern הַמֶּרְכָּבָה הַכְּרוּבִים," "hammercheba hacherubim," where the allusion is open, "the chariot of the cherubim;" and Ezekiel describes his cherubim as a triumphal chariot, chap. x. It is not, therefore, unlikely that their name is derived from רָכַב, which sig-

nifies "to ride," or "to be carried," "to pass on swiftly," expressing the angelical ministry of the blessed spirits above; if they were not rather mere emblems of the power and speed of God in his works of grace and providence.

15. These cherubim are said to be מִקְשָׁה,—that is, not *molten*, but *beaten* even and smooth; and seem to have been one continued piece with the mercy-seat, beat out with it and from it. There is no more mention of their form, but only that they had faces and wings. Of what sort those faces were, or how many in number were their wings, is not expressed.

16. In Ezekiel's vision of the "living creatures,"—which he also calleth "cherubim," chap. x. 2,—there is the shape of a man ascribed unto them: "They had the likeness of a man," chap. i. 5; "faces," verse 6; "feet," verse 7; "hands," verse 8; "sides," or "bodies," verses 8, 11. Each of them also had four faces, of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, verse 10; and each had four wings, verse 23. In John's vision in the Revelation, seeming to answer this of Ezekiel's cherubim, from the eyes that his living creatures were full of, and the appearance of their faces, they had each of them six wings, answering unto those of the seraphim in the vision of Isaiah, chap. vi. 2.

17. The Jews generally affirm, that these visions of the glory of God by Isaiah and Ezekiel were the same, and that Ezekiel saw nothing but what Isaiah saw also; only, they say that Ezekiel saw the glory of God and his majesty, as a countryman who admires at all the splendour of the court of the king, Isaiah as a courtier who takes notice only of the person of the king himself. But there are many evident differences in their visions. Isaiah calls the glorious ministers of God שְׂרָפִים, "seraphim," from their nature, compared to fire and light; Ezekiel, כְּרֻבִים, "cherubim," from their speed in the accomplishment of their duty. Isaiah saw his vision as in the temple: for although from these words, "I saw the LORD sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple," Aben Ezra and Kimchi suppose that he saw the throne of God in heaven, and only his train of glory descending into the temple, yet it is more probable that he saw the throne itself in the temple, his train spreading abroad to the filling of the whole house; for He calls the temple, "the throne of his glory," Jer. xiv. 21, and "a glorious high throne," chap. xvii. 12,—that is, "a throne high and lifted up," as in this place. Ezekiel saw his vision abroad in the open field, by the river of Chebar, chap. i. 3. Isaiah first saw the Lord himself, and then his glorious attendants; Ezekiel first saw the chariot of his glory, and then God above it. Isaiah's seraphim had six wings, with two whereof they covered their faces, which Ezekiel's cherubim had not; and that because Isaiah's vision represented Christ,

John xii. 41, with the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles and rejection of the Jews, which the angels were not able to look into, Eph. iii. 9, 10, and were therefore said to cover their faces with their wings, as not being able to look into the depths of those mysteries: but in Ezekiel's vision, when they attended the will of God in the works of his providence, they looked upon them with "open face." Wherefore, from the diversity in all these visions, it appears that nothing certain concerning the form or wings of the cherubim made by Moses can be collected. Most probably they had each of them only one face, directly looking one towards the other, and each two wings, which, being stretched out forward over the mercy-seat, met each other, and were mere emblems of the divine presence and care over his covenant, people, and worship.

18. And this was the whole furniture of the most holy place in the tabernacle of Moses. In that of the temple of Solomon, which was more august and spacious, there were, by God's direction, two other cherubim added. These were great and large, made of the wood of the olive-tree, overlaid with gold; and they stood on their feet behind the ark westward, with their backs towards the end of the oracle, their faces over the ark and mercy-seat eastward, toward the sanctuary; their wings extending twenty cubits long, even the whole breadth of the house, and meeting in the midst; their inward wings were over the ark, 1 Kings vi. 23–28; 2 Chron. iii. 10–13.

19. And this was that appearance of his glory which the Lord God of Israel granted unto his church of old; which though it was beautiful and excellent, as appointed by himself, yet was it but carnal and worldly in comparison of the heavenly and glorious mysteries of the gospel, especially of Him who, being obscurely shadowed out by all this preparation of glory, was in himself the real "brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person," as shall further be declared on Heb. i. 3.

EXERCITATION XXIII.

OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

1. Of the office of the priesthood—The high priest in particular, the most illustrious type of Christ. 2. The call of Aaron to the priesthood. 3. Things concurring to his call, and separation to his office. 4, 5. The garments prescribed to him—Ordinary; 6. Extraordinary. 7. The nature of the office of the high priest—What he performed himself alone; what with the assistance of other priests; what with the assistance of priests and Levites.

8. His blessing the people—His judging of them. 9. The succession of these priests. 10. How many served under the tabernacle; 11. How many under the first temple: 12. How many under the second temple—The disturbance of the succession—Fatal end of the Aaronical priesthood.

1. THE principal glory of all Mosaical worship consisted in the person and office of the *high priest.* The Scripture calls him הַכֹּהֵן, הַגָּדוֹל, [Lev. xxi. 10], "the great priest," ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας, or ἀρχιερεύς. This priest, with his attendants of the same family, was the hinge whereon the whole worship of the Judaical church depended and turned; and therefore our apostle doth undeniably prove that "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" was to be changed, because there was a promise of raising up a Priest that was not of the house of Aaron, nor of the tribe of Levi, which the observation of the law in the worship of God could not consist withal, Heb. vii. 11, 12. Now this high priest being, in his person and his office, the most illustrious type of the Messiah and his office, and the principal means whereby God instructed his church of old in the mystery of the reconciliation and salvation of sinners, most things concerning him are expressly and at large handled by our apostle, and must, God assisting, come under our consideration in the several places wherein by him they are insisted on. I shall therefore here only, in these previous discourses, give a brief account of some such concernments of his person and office as will not directly again occur unto us.

2. What was the state and condition of the priesthood in the church from the foundation of the world until the time we now treat of, by whom that office was executed, how they came unto it, and wherein it did consist, I have declared elsewhere. The foundation of an especial priesthood in the church of Israel is laid Exod. xxviii. 1. Provision being made of holy things, God proceeds to supply the church with holy or dedicate persons for their administration. The first thing expressed is the call of the high priest. Hereof there are two parts;—first, God's revelation and *authoritative constitution* concerning it; secondly, His actual *consecration.*

The former is expressed, Exod. xxviii. 1, "And take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office." Aaron was the elder brother of Moses, born three years before him, Exod. vii. 7; and was now eighty-four or eighty-five years of age when God thus calls and appoints him to the office of the priesthood. With him all his sons, all the males of his family, were dedicated unto the service of God in their successive generations. And in this call unto his office he was a type of Christ, who entered not on his priesthood but by the designation and authority of the Father, Heb. v. 4, 5.

3. Secondly, Unto the completing of his call, there concurred his consecration, or separation unto God, at large described, Exod. xxix.

In general it is expressed, verse 1, by לְקַדֵּשׁ, which we render to "hallow;" that is, to sanctify, to separate unto God in the work of the priesthood. This is the general expression of his consecration; for what we afterwards translate to "consecrate," verses 9, 29, respects only one particular act of the whole work or duty. Now the parts hereof were many, which may briefly be enumerated:—

First, There was their *manuduction*, their bringing to the door of the tabernacle: Chap. xxix. 4, תַּקְרִיב,—"Thou shalt bring them nigh;" the word used in all sacred approaches and dedications to God. The priests themselves were made a "corban."

Secondly, They were *washed with water:* Verse 4, "Thou shalt wash them with water." After this the priests on all occasions were to wash themselves; at present, this being a sacred action, and they being not as yet consecrated, it was performed towards them by Moses; who at this and other times discharged the office of an extraordinary priest.

Thirdly, Being washed, they were clothed with the *holy garments*, verses 5, 6; of which afterwards.

Fourthly, The high priest being clothed, was *anointed* with the *holy oil* poured on his head, and running down over all his garments, verse 7; Ps. cxxxiii. 2. The making and use of this ointment, prefiguring the unction of the Lord Christ with all the graces of the Spirit, Heb. i. 9, are declared Exod. xxx. 23–33.

Fifthly, Sacrifices of all sorts were offered unto God:—1. The Mincha, or meat-offering, Exod. xxix. 41; 2. The Chataath, or sin-offering, verses 13, 14; 3. The Ghola, or whole burnt-offering, verses 18, 25; 4. Shelamim, or peace-offerings, verse 28; 5. Terumoth and Tenuphoth, heave and wave offerings, verses 26, 27; 6. Nesek, or the drink-offering, verse 40. So that in the consecration of the priest all sacrifices also were, as it were, anew consecrated unto God.

Sixthly, In the use of these sacrifices there were five ceremonies used, belonging in a peculiar manner unto their consecration:—1. The *filling of their hand:* Verse 9, וּמִלֵּאתָ יַד. This we have rendered, "Thou shalt consecrate them;" as though their consecration were some peculiar act distinct from these prescribed ceremonies. But that which is thus expressed is only one of them, or the putting of some parts of the sacrifice into or upon their hands, to bear to the altar; which being the first action in them belonging to the sacerdotal office (for in all the former passages they were merely passive) is sometimes, by a synecdoche, used for consecration itself. 2. The *putting of blood* upon the *tip* of their right *ear*, and upon the *thumb* of their right hand, and the *great toe* of their right foot, verse 20; intimating their readiness to hear and perform the will of God. And this blood was taken from one of the rams that were offered for a burnt-offering. 3. The *sprinkling of them* with blood from the altar and the

anointing oil together, upon all their garments, verse 21. 4. The *imposition or laying of their hands* on the head of the beast to be sacrificed for a sin-offering, verses 10, 15; denoting the passing away of their sins from them, that they might be fit to minister before the Lord. 5. The delivery of the wave-offering into their hands as a pledge of their future portion, verses 24, 28.

Seventhly, The *continuance* of all this ceremony is observed, verse 30. By the repetition of the sacrifices mentioned, it was continued seven days. During this time Aaron and his sons abode night and day at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; after all which they were admitted unto and administered in their office. Now, all this solemnity was used by the appointment of God, partly to beget a reverence in the priests themselves unto his worship and in the administration of it, partly to teach and instruct the whole church in the mysteries of their redemption by the true High Priest, whose person and office were shadowed out hereby, as afterwards will more fully appear.

4. Immediately upon the revelation of the mind of God for the setting apart of Aaron to the priesthood, he prescribes the garments that he was to use in the discharge of the duties of his office; for the worship now instituted being outward and carnal, that which made an appearance of "glory and beauty," as these vestments did, was of principal consideration therein.

These garments of the high priest were of two sorts;—first, Those of his ordinary and constant ministration in the sanctuary; secondly, Those of his annual and extraordinary ministry in the most holy place. The first are appointed Exod. xxviii., consisting of eight parts:—

First, מִכְנְסֵי־בַד לְכַסּוֹת בְּשַׂר עֶרְוָה;—"Breeches of linen to cover the flesh of his nakedness," Exod. xxviii. 42, 43; that is, to wear next unto him on his loins.

Secondly, הַכֻּתֹּנֶת שֵׁשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה אֹרֶג, Exod. xxxix. 27,—A "coat of fine linen," or silk, which was next him over the breeches, from the shoulders unto the ancles.

Thirdly, הָאַבְנֵט, Exod. xxxix. 29,—"A girdle of silk," or twined linen, with purple, blue, and scarlet, wherewith he girt the coat under the paps or breast.

Fourthly, מְעִיל, Exod. xxviii. 4, "a robe," all of blue, with bells and pomegranates of gold hanging interchangeably at the fringes of it, in number, as the Jews say, seventy-two of each sort. This robe covered the coat and girdle.

Fifthly, Upon the robe was אֵפוֹד, "the ephod;" which name we have retained, as not finding any garment in use elsewhere that should answer unto it. It was a covering for the shoulders, made of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine linen, curiously wrought. On the top hereof, on the shoulders of the priest, were two precious

stones,—onyx, say some, beryl, say others,—with the names of the tribes of the children of Israel engraven on them, six on one stone, and six on the other. Exod. xxviii. 6–12.

Sixthly, חֹשֶׁן, which we render "a breastplate," wrought as the ephod, and of the same materials. Herein were fastened, in ouches of gold, twelve precious stones, with the names of the tribes engraven on them; which jewel, because of its use in judgment, was called, as I suppose, Urim and Thummim, Exod. xxviii. 15–21, 30.

Seventhly, מִצְנֶפֶת, or "a mitre" for the head, made of fine linen, after the fashion of an eastern turban, sixteen cubits long, wreathed about his head, Exod. xxviii. 4.

Eighthly, צִיץ זָהָב, "a plate," a flowering of gold, fastened with a lace of blue on the fore front of the mitre, whereon was engraven קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה,—"Holiness to the LORD," Exod. xxviii. 36.

5. I have only named these things, without further consideration of them; partly because they have been inquired into and controverted by many already, and partly because I cannot myself come unto any certainty about sundry things relating unto them. The colours which we render "blue, purple, and scarlet," with the substance of that which we after translate "fine linen," cannot be clearly manifested what they were. The stones of the breastplate and ephod for the most part are unknown, and their names are applied only by conjecture unto such whose names are known to us. Concerning these things the Jews themselves are at a loss, and give us only various rumours and surmises, and I shall not add to the heap of conjectures which have already been cast into this treasury.

6. Secondly, The extraordinary garments of the high priest I call them which he wore only on the day of atonement; because they were worn but once only, and these he used not in the whole service of that day, but only when he entered into the most holy place. Now these, though for the kind of them they were the same with the linen garments before mentioned, yet they were made particularly for that day, for after the service of that day they were laid up in one of the chambers belonging unto the sanctuary; and they were four, linen breeches, a linen coat, a linen girdle, and a linen mitre, Lev. xvi. 4, 23. These the Jews call the בגדי לבן, "white garments," as the others his בגדי זהב, "garments of gold."

7. The high priest being thus arrayed, was prepared for the work of his office, which was threefold:—1. To *offer sacrifices* to God for the people; 2. To *bless the people* in the name of God; 3. To *judge them.* For the first, our apostle declares it and insists upon it frequently in this Epistle, chap. vii. 27, viii. 3, ix. 7, x. 1.

And, first, his work in the business of sacrifices was threefold:—

First, That which he performed *himself alone*, none being admitted to assist him, or to be present with him, or so much as to look

upon him. This was that which he performed when he carried the blood into the most holy place on the day of atonement, Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix. 7. The sacrifice before the ark, mercy-seat, and cherubims, was peculiar to himself alone. And in case of any occasional hinderance or impediment that might befall him, there was always a second priest who was substituted in his room, that the great service of that day might not be omitted.

Secondly, That which he performed *assisted by other priests.* Such was the whole service of the sanctuary, Heb. ix. 6, about the daily incense, the shew-bread, the candlesticks and lamps, even all the service of the holy place.

Thirdly, That wherein he had the assistance of the other *priests*, and the service of the *Levites.* Such were all the services of the court at the brazen altar, where the Levites assisted in the killing, flaying, and removal of the bodies of the beasts that were sacrificed.

The especial seasons of these services, diurnal, sabbatical, monthly, and annual, are of too great variety and extent to be here insisted on.

8. Secondly, His blessing of the people was twofold:—*First, Solemn*, at stated seasons, according unto a form prescribed unto him, Num. vi. 23–27. *Secondly, Occasional*, with respect unto particular seasons, as Eli blessed Hannah, 1 Sam. i. 17.

Thirdly, His work also was to judge the people:—*First*, In things concerning the house and worship of God, Zech. iii. 7. *Secondly*, In hard and difficult cases he joined with the judge or ruler in judging between men, according to the law, Deut. xvii. 12. *Thirdly*, He was always a member of the sanhedrin. This, I know, is denied by some of the Jews, but it seems to be warranted from Deut. xvii. 8–13.

9. Being thus appointed in his office, a succession also therein was designed,—namely, by the first-born male of the eldest family or branch of the posterity or house of Aaron. But the tracing of this succession in particular is greatly perplexed, for it is nowhere directly given us in the Scripture for that space of time wherein the story of the church is recorded therein. Different names are also in several places given unto the same persons, as seems most probable. Besides, Josephus, who is the only approved writer of the Jews in things of this nature, is either corrupted in some passages on this subject, or doth palpably contradict himself. The post-Talmudical masters are so far from yielding any relief in this matter, that by their jarrings and wranglings they render it more perplexed. Neither have those amongst our writers who of old or of late have laboured to trace this succession been able to agree in their computations. Four or five differing catalogues I could give in that are contended for with some earnestness. I shall not therefore hope, in this brief account of things which I am confined unto, to give light unto a matter of such intricacy and perplexity.

I shall therefore content myself to give the most passant account among the Jews of this succession in general, with some few observations upon it, and so close this discourse.

10. It is generally agreed, after Josephus, that the whole number of high priests, from Aaron inclusively to the destruction of the second temple, was eighty and three; for though in the Babylonian Talmud some of them reckon up above eighty high priests under the second temple alone, yet the more learned of the later Jews, as the author of Tzemach David ad Millen. iv. anno 829, expressly prefer the authority of Josephus above them all.

Of these eighty-three, thirteen administered before the Lord under the tabernacle, or whilst the tabernacle built by Moses in the wilderness was the sacred seat of divine worship and ordinances. Of these the first was Aaron, the last Abiathar, who was put past the priesthood by Solomon a little before the building of the temple. And in this succession there was but one interruption,—namely, when Eli of the house of Ithamar, the younger son of Aaron, was preferred to the priesthood. It is probable that he had been second priest in the days of his predecessor, and was doubtless admitted unto the office upon the reputation of his holiness and wisdom; and, it may be, that he whose right it was to succeed of the house of Phinehas was either incapable or judged unworthy.

11. In the first, or Solomon's temple, there administered eighteen high priests, whose names are recounted by Josephus, lib. x. cap. viii., lib. xx. cap. x. Of these the first was Zadok, the last Jehozadak, who was carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, 1 Chron. vi. 14; though I question whether ever he administered as high priest, only he was left at the destruction of the city and temple, after the death of his father, Seraiah. Nor was there any known interruption in this series of succession, being carried down in a right line from the house of Phinehas by Zadok.

12. The remainder of the number before mentioned served under the second temple, being multiplied by the tumults and disorders which the people then fell into. The first of them was Joshua the son of Josedech; the last one Phinehas, or Phananias, made high priest by the seditious villains a little before the last siege and destruction of the city.

And this succession, or that during this season, had interruptions many and great. The first mentioned by Josephus was after the death of Onias, the fourteenth high priest from the building of the temple, when Antiochus first put in Joshua, who was called Jason, the brother of Onias, and afterwards displacing him, thrust Menelaus into his room. After a while he puts out this Menelaus, and placeth one Alcimus, of another family, in his stead.

After this Alcimus, the family of the Maccabees, or Asmonæans,

took on them the office of the high priesthood. Their race being extirpated by Herod, Ananus, a private priest, was by force and power put into the place. And from this time forward to the destruction of the temple there was no order observed in the succession of the high priest, but persons were put in and out at the pleasure of the rulers, either the Romans or the Herodians; for Hyrcanus being taken prisoner by the Parthians, and Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus his brother, being taken by Herod and Sosia, and crucified at Antioch by Mark Antony, in whom the race of the Asmonæans ended, vile persons were put in and out at pleasure, some for a year, some for a month, one for a day, some for a longer season, until the whole nation, church and state, rushing into its final and fatal ruin, in their rebellion at Jerusalem, they thrust out Matthias, put in by Agrippa, and chose one by lot to succeed him; when God, to manifest his disapprobation of them, caused the lot to fall upon one Phananias, a mere idiot, who knew nothing of the place or office which they called him unto, with whom ended the church and priesthood of the Jews.

EXERCITATION XXIV.

SACRIFICES OF THE OLD LAW.

1. Sacrifices the principal worship of God. 2. Three sorts of them: (1.) Of the brazen altar; (2.) Of the sanctuary; (3.) Of the most holy place. 3. Referred to by the apostle. 4. All sacrifices of the altar were קָרְבָּנִים. 5. Every Corban either Isha or Terumah. 6. אִשִּׁים of six sorts: (1.) Ghola; (2.) Mincha; (3.) Chataath; (4.) Asham; (5.) Milluim; (6.) Shelamim. 7. A second distinction of fire-offerings—Either Zebach or Mincha. 8–12. These distinctions and differences explained at large. 13. The matter of all sacrifices. 14. עֹלָה, the first particular sacrifice—The rise, use, and direction of it. 15. Use of it among the heathen. 16, 17. What of ancient tradition, what of their own invention. 18–21. The manner of this sacrifice. 22. The end of it—To make expiation or atonement, what. 23. Seasons and occasions of this sacrifice. 24. מִנְחָה, a meat-offering. 25. The use of that name; general, particular. 26, 27. The matter of this offering. 28. נֶסֶךְ, the drink-offering—The matter of it. 29. The Mincha not the most ancient kind of sacrifice. 30. זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, peace-offerings. 31. Reason of the name. 32. Matter of this offering. 33, 34. Things peculiar to this kind of sacrifice. 35. The use of it among the heathen. 36. חַטָּאת, the sin-offering—The name and causes of it. 37. Sins בְּשֵׁגָגָה, what. 38. The persons to offer this sacrifice. 39. The anointed priest, who, Lev. iv. 3; 40. The whole congregation; the ruler; a private person. 41. The time and season of this sacrifice. 42. The sprinkling of blood in it. 43. אָשָׁם, the trespass-offering—Its difference from the sin-offering. 44. מִלּוּאִים, consecration-offerings. 45. Second sort of Corbans—Terumoth.

1. THE principal worship and service of God, both in the tabernacle and temple, consisted in *offerings* and *sacrifices:* for these

did directly represent, and in their general nature answered, that which was the foundation of the church and all the worship thereof,—namely, the sacrifice of the Son of God; and he is called "The Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," John i. 29, because he fulfilled and perfectly accomplished what was prefigured by the sacrifice of lambs, and other creatures, from the foundation of the world. Neither were these offerings and sacrifices any thing but means of God's institution, for men to express by them their faith in the first promise. Nor were sacrifices in general now first instituted, nor the kinds of them first appointed, but the most of them were observed, upon divine revelation and command, from the entrance of sin and giving of the promise; only, they were rescued, in the repetition of them unto Moses, from the superstition that was grown in their observance, and directed unto a right object, and attended with suitable instructive ceremonies in the manner of their performance.

2. Now these offerings were of three sorts;—first, Those of the court, or *brazen altar*, by blood and fire; secondly, Those of the sanctuary, at the *altar of incense* and table of shew-bread; thirdly, Those of the *most holy place*, before the ark, mercy-seat, and oracle. The first of these represented the bloody death of Christ, and his sacrifice on the cross; the second, his intercession in heaven; and the third, the ἀποτελέσματα, or effects of both, in atonement and reconciliation. And these our apostle mentions, Heb. viii. 3, 4, "Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices:" and "There are priests that offer gifts according to the law." Chap. ix. 7, "Into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and the errors of the people." Verse 12, "By the blood of goats and calves." Verse 13, "The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkled." Verse 22, "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood." Chap. x. 1–5, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not." Verse 11, "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin." Chap. xiii. 11, "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp."

3. Evident it is that these and the like passages, wherein our apostle refers to the institution, nature, use, end, and manner of the observation of sacrifices, cannot be rightly understood without some distinct notion of them, as prescribed by God unto Moses, and observed by the people under the old testament. I shall, therefore, here give a brief system of them, and account concerning them.

4. Sacrifices of the altar in general were קָרְבָּנִים, "corbanim." The name, it may be, of קָרְבָּן is not distinctly applied unto every sort of them; but whereas every thing that any man הִקְרִיב, "brought nigh," to dedicate or offer unto God, was thence קָרְבָּן, we may allow it to be the general name of all sacrifices. And therefore, on the close of the enumeration of all fire-offerings, it is added, "This is the law which the LORD commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer" (or "bring nigh") אֶת קָרְבָּנֵיהֶם, "their corbans," that is, offerings or sacrifices of all sorts, Lev. vii. 37, 38.

5. Now, every קָרְבָּן was either אִשֶּׁה, "isha," "a firing," or תְּרוּמָה, "terumah," "an heave-offering," or תְּנוּפָה, "tenuphah," "a wave-offering." The אִשִּׁים, "ishim," were קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים, "kodesh kodashim," "holiness of holinesses," or most holy, all but one; the others were קֹדֶשׁ הִלּוּלִים, "kodesh hillulim," "holiness of praises," Lev. xix. 24.

6. The אִשִּׁים, or "firings," fire-offerings, were expressly of six sorts, as they are distinctly set down, Lev. vii. 37:—1. עוֹלָה, "ghola," "the burnt-offering;" 2. מִנְחָה, "mincha," "the meat-offering;" 3. חַטָּאת, "chataath," "the sin-offering;" 4. אָשָׁם, "asham," "the trespass-offering;" 5. מִלּוּאִים, "milluim," "consecrations;" 6. זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, "zebach shelamim," "peace-offerings." So are they rendered by ours, how rightly we shall see afterwards. Besides, the מִנְחָה, "mincha," contained that properly called the "meat-offering," and נֶסֶךְ, "nesek," the "drink-offering." The LXX. render the verse, *οὗτος ὁ νόμος τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων, καὶ θυσίας, καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ τῆς πλημμελείας, καὶ τῆς τελειώσεως, καὶ τῆς θυσίας τοῦ σωτηρίου·*—"This is the law of whole burnt-offerings and of sacrifices, and for sin and trespass, and of perfection" (or "consummation"), "and of the sacrifice of salvation." The particulars shall be examined as they occur. The Vulgar Latin reads the words, "Lex holocausti, et sacrificii pro peccato et delicto, et pro consecratione, et pacificorum victimis;"—"This is the law of the whole burnt-offering, and of the sacrifice for sin and trespass, and for consecration, and for the sacrifices of peace-makers." And herein either the mincha is wholly left out, or the words should be read, "et sacrificii, et pro peccato," and so answer to the Greek, expressing מִנְחָה by *θυσία*, "sacrificium," though improperly.

7. These אִשִּׁים, "fire-offerings," are moreover distinguished into

זֶבַח, "zebach," and מִנְחָה, "mincha," in a large sense. For it is evident that מִנְחָה, "mincha," is used very variously; for,—1. Sometimes it is of as large a signification as קָרְבָּן, "corban," itself, and is frequently applied unto offerings of blood, as well as of meat and drink, Gen. iv. 4. 2. Sometimes it is contradistinguished to זֶבַח, and denotes all sacrifices by fire, not of beasts and blood, Ps. xl. 7; Dan. ix. 27; Lev. vii. 37. 3. Sometimes it signifies that peculiar offering, which, being made of flour or meal with oil, we call the meat offering, Lev. ii. 1. Wherefore in this distribution, זֶבַח, θυσία, "victima, sacrificium mactatum," "a slain sacrifice," compriseth עוֹלָה, "ghola," חַטָּאת, "chataath," אָשָׁם, "asham," and שְׁלָמִים, "shelamim;" מִנְחָה, "mincha," that which was peculiarly so, and נֶסֶךְ, "nesek." מִלּוּאִים, "milluim," partook of both. And these things must be a little further explained.

8. First, קָרְבָּן, "corban," the general name of all sacrifices, taken from their general nature, in that they were all brought nigh unto God, is usually rendered by the Vulgar Latin "oblatio," and by us, suitably, "an offering;" it is properly, "appropinquatio," "a drawing nigh," from קָרַב, "to approach, to draw near." The LXX. render it constantly by δῶρον, "a gift," unless it be Neh. x. 34, xiii. 31. Δῶρον is "munus, donum," and so is it rendered by the evangelist, Matt. v. 23, 24, and xv. 5. Usually it is such a gift as is presented to appease, reconcile, or obtain favour; which amongst men the Hebrews call שֹׁחַד, "shochad." So Plato, [De Repub. lib. iii.],—

Δῶρα θεοὺς πείθει, δῶρ' αἰδοίους βασιλῆας·

which the poet [Ovid. Art. Amat. iii. 653] translates,—

"Munera (crede mihi) capiunt hominesque Deosque:
Placatur donis Juppiter ipse datis."

And this Jotham in his parable seems to allude unto, Judges ix. 13, where he brings in the vine saying, "Shall I leave my wine, הַמְשַׂמֵּחַ אֱלֹהִים וַאֲנָשִׁים,"—"delighting God and man?" namely, in sacrifices and gifts; which are a great propitiation, which always ariseth from a savour of rest. Corban, then, is any gift brought nigh and offered unto God in any sort.

9. Of these offerings or gifts some were אִשִּׁים, "ishim." אִשֶּׁה is first mentioned, Exod. xxix. 18, "Thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar: it is a burnt-offering unto the LORD: רֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ אִשֶּׁה לַיהוָה,"—"a savour of rest, a firing unto the LORD;" "ignitio." Thus all sacrifices were called that were burned on the altar, either wholly or any part of them. The Greeks, who thought they had no proper word to express this by (as frequently, in all their abundance, they are straitened in expressing the signal emphasis of the divine Hebrew), have variously rendered it,—not once properly, or with any intimation of the native importance of the word. Sometimes they

translate it θυσίασμα, Exod. xxix. 18; sometimes θυσία, to the same purpose, Lev. xi. 13, ii. 2, "a sacrifice;" sometimes κάρπωμα, Lev. ii. 9, that is, "an oblation, an offering;" thus most frequently. But whereas that word signifies primarily the "seed of fruit," or the profit made by it, and is but tralatitiously accommodated unto oblations, it doth most improperly express אִשֶּׁה, which principally intended the sacrifices of beasts as burned in the fire. It is, then, the general name of all sacrifices or gifts burned on the altar, in part or in whole.

10. Every אִשֶּׁה, or "fire-offering," was either זֶבַח or מִנְחָה. Zebach the Greeks render constantly by θυσία, and words of the same original; that is, a sacrifice of slain beasts,—"victima, hostia mactata." Θύω is "to sacrifice by killing;" though I know that Eustathius thinks that Homer useth θύειν only for θυμιάζειν; but its constant use in all authors is "to kill in sacrifice," and θυσία is properly "a slain sacrifice," though it be often used in the Scripture metaphorically. So doth זָבַח signify, properly the same with טָבַח, Teth and Zain being easily and often changed; that is, "to kill and slay." And Elias Levita observes, that it is but twice used when it doth not directly denote killing. And from this kind of sacrifices had the altar its name, מִזְבֵּחַ, "misbeach;" and so in the Greek, θυσιαστήριον. Now, of the sacrifices that were זְבָחִים, there were four sorts:—1. עוֹלָה, "the burnt-offering;" 2. חַטָּאת, "the sin-offering;" 3. אָשָׁם, "the trespass-offering;" 4. שְׁלָמִים, "peace-offerings;" and in part also the מִלּוּאִים, or "consecration-offerings," etc., as was before observed.

11. מִנְחָה, the second species of the אִשִּׁים. The word is of an uncertain original and various signification. Those who suppose that it respected only offerings of the fruits of the earth are greatly mistaken. Instances have been given already to the contrary, and more shall be added. Generally, learned men deduce the word from מָנַח, that Mem may be esteemed a radical letter[1] (whence in the plural number it is read מִנְחוֹת in the Mishnah), which yet is but a feigned radix, nowhere used in the original or the Targum: and it is read מִנְחוֹת in the Scripture, as Ps. xx. 4. Hence some deduce it from נָחָה, "to lead or bring to;" making it agree in its general signification with קָרְבָּן, "corban." Some think it may rather be deduced from הֵנִיחַ, "to refresh, recreate, give rest;" and that because it is called emphatically a "savour of rest unto the LORD," Lev. ii. 2. The LXX. sometimes render it μαναά, manifesting that they knew not the precise importance of the word, and therefore left it untranslated. It comprised, as was said, the mincha properly so called, and the נֶסֶךְ,

[1] "Quia pluralem ejus absolutum Rabbini efferunt מִנְחוֹת, Mem cum Scheva ideo radicale censetur; si autem מ esset servile, diceretur נִחוֹת."—Buxtorf. Lex. Heb. et Chald. s.v., נָחָה.—ED.

or "drink-offering," and had a place also in the offerings of consecration. And these were the "corbanim," or "oblations," that were "ishim," or "fire-offerings," and קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "most holy to the LORD."

12. Of the other sort of offerings, which were only קֹדֶשׁ הִלּוּלִים, "holiness of praises," there was no general name; but they were either תְּרוּמָה, "terumah," "the heave-offering," or תְּנוּפָה, "tenuphah," "the wave-offering," whereof we shall speak afterwards.

13. The matter of all these sacrifices was of three sorts;—1. Beasts; 2. Fowls or birds; 3. Fruits of the earth; all accompanied with salt and incense. Of beasts there were also three sorts designed to this use and service,—one of the herds, namely, bullocks; and two of the flocks,—1. *Sheep*, 2. *Goats*. Of *fowls* or birds, two sorts were used,—1. *Turtles*, 2. *Pigeons;* and it may be sparrows, in the singular case of the sacrifice for the cleansing of the leper, Lev. xiv. 4. In all of these (that is, of the beasts), it was required that they should be,—1. *Males*, unless in the sin and trespass offering; 2. Without *blemish*. The fruits of the earth were of all sorts useful to the life of man. And all these sacrifices, from their general ends, may be reduced unto three heads: for they were all of them either,—1. *Propitiatory*, as designed to make atonement for sins; or, 2. *Euctical*, to impetrate mercies from God; or, 3. *Eucharistical*, to return praises unto him.

14. The first particular sacrifice instituted in the church of Israel, regulated and directed Lev. i., was the עוֹלָה, "the burnt-offering." I say it was then first prescribed unto that church after the rearing of the tabernacle, and regulated as to the times, occasions, and seasons of its celebration; for as to the nature of it, it was instituted and observed from the foundation of the world. And it seems to have been the first acceptable sacrifice, namely, that which Abel offered, Gen. iv. 4; for whereas it is expressly said of the offering of Cain, not only that it was mincha, but that it was "of the fruits of the earth," that is, a meat-offering, it is said only of Abel that he brought מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאנוֹ וּמֵחֶלְבֵהֶן, "of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof,"—that is, either with their fat, or the fat firstlings, the proper matter of this sacrifice. Our apostle calls it his δῶρον, his "gift,"—that is, his קָרְבָּן, or "free-will offering," as all were before the law; and his θυσία, Heb. xi. 4, "the sacrifice that he slew to the LORD." But the name is first expressed, Gen. viii. 20, where both the matter and nature also of it are set down: "Noah builded an altar unto the LORD; and took of every clean beast" (bullocks, sheep, and goats), "and of every clean fowl" (turtles and pigeons), —this God had instructed him in,—וַיַּעַל עֹלֹת, "and offered burnt-offerings on the altar." So did Job, before the giving of the law, chap. i. 5; which God also prescribed unto his friends, chap.

xlii. 8; as did Jethro also in the wilderness, Exod. xviii. 12. For from that sacrifice of Noah was this rite of whole burnt-offerings derived by tradition unto all nations of his posterity; but the end and use of it being lost, it was in process of time, by the craft of Satan, turned into the chiefest way of exercising their idolatry.

15. The matter, therefore, of this sacrifice was preserved among the heathen, although they made use of other creatures also than what were allowed in the law of Moses, or applied unto that purpose by any who were guided by divine direction. Their principal solemn sacrifices were of the herd; which therefore they called *βουθυσία*, or "buthysia," "the sacrifice of oxen," and of all sorts of kine:—

> "Taurum Neptuno, taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo,"

as Virgil, [Æn. iii. 119.] And he also expresseth the way of offering these bulls or oxen to Neptune, Apollo, and others of their feigned deities, [Æn. vi. 253]:—

> "Et solida imponit taurorum viscera flammis;"—
>
> "They committed their whole inwards unto flames on the altar;"

which expresseth this holocaust. And they offered kine of all sorts. So Homer tells us that Nestor sacrificed *ἧνιν*,—that is, an heifer or a bullock of one year old; *ἐνιαυσιαῖον*, saith Eustathius, as in many cases the law directed. And the poet adds, [Iliad, κ. 293],—

> Ἣν οὔπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀνήρ·—
>
> "Which none had brought to the yoke;"

as the same was required in the sacrifices of the law. To the moon they sacrificed a bullock, whose horns had turned into the likeness of her first appearance, [Æn. vi. 251]:—

> —— "Sterilemque tibi, Proserpina, vaccam;"—
>
> "And a barren heifer to Proserpina."

And Plutarch telleth us that some of the old Egyptians offered a red heifer in sacrifice; which I much doubt, and suppose rather the report to have risen from the ceremonies of the red cow instituted in the wilderness, when the people came out of Egypt. But whereas an ox was a harmless and useful creature, some of them began at length to suppose that it was not meet to use them in sacrifice: but, to keep up the old tradition of this kind of offering, they made a cake, which they called papanon, and fashioned it into the similitude of an ox, and termed it an ox; as Hesychius in *Πάπανον*. So the images of idolatrous groves, placed by idolaters in the temple of old, are called groves in the Scripture, and the small shrines made for Diana are called temples.

16. Sheep also they sacrificed, especially lambs, to Jupiter, Mi-

nerva, and Diana; and goats or kids to Bacchus. Whence is that of the poet, [Ovid. Fast. lib. i. 357]:—

> "Rode, caper, vitem: tamen hinc, cum stabis ad aram,
> In tua quod spargi cornua possit, erit;"—

> "The vines cropt by the goat yet wine suffice
> To sprinkle him when made a sacrifice;"

which, as Suetonius testifies, was bitterly reflected on Nero Cæsar, upon his foolish edict for the cutting down of vines in Italy. Birds or fowls also they offered or sacrificed, but without distinction,—cocks, geese, turtles, and the like.

17. But besides these things, that were of ancient tradition, they added as the matter of their sacrifices all sorts of living creatures, even such as the law of nature refused, and such as among the Jews were in an especial manner forbidden; neither ever were they in use amongst the first fathers of the world, until after the dispersion at Babel. Of the first sort was their sacrificing of men, which I have elsewhere showed to have been catholic in the world. Of the latter, to omit horses, dogs, and the like, we may take an instance in that of swine. Ὑοθυσία, the offering of swine, was the principal, and, as the most of them judged, the most ancient kind of sacrifice amongst them. This they constantly used, whether in consecrations, or lustrations, or confirmations of covenants,—the most solemn occasions of their sacrifices. So in the first way he speaks in Aristophanes, [EIP. 374.]:—

> Ἐς χοιρίδιόν μοί νυν δάνεισον τρεῖς δραχμάς,
> Δεῖ γὰρ μυηθῆναί με πρὶν τεθνηκέναι·—

> "Money I want, a sacred swine to buy;
> I would be consecrate before I die."

And in case of lustration or expiation, Plautus speaks to the same purpose in his Mænechmi, [Act. ii. Sc. ii. 15]:—

> "Adolescens, quibus hic pretiis porci veneunt sacres, sinceri?
> Nummum unum en a me accipe; jube te piari de mea pecunia;
> Nam ego quidem insanum esse te certe scio;"—

"Young man, what is here the price of swine fit for sacrifice? take a piece of silver of me, and get thyself expiated" (or "freed from thy malady by sacrifice") "with my money; for I know certainly that thou art mad."

And another says concerning covenants, [Æn. viii. 645]:—

> "Cæsâ jungebant fœdera porca;"—
> "They ratified their covenants by the sacrifice of a female swine."

But this by the way. We return.

18. First, The nature and manner of it in the church of Israel is directed, Lev. i. In general, as was said, it was קָרְבָּן, "corban," "a gift brought nigh to God." Verse 3, אִם־עֹלָה קָרְבָּנוֹ;—"If his corban be ghola." From עָלָה, "ghala," "ascendit," "to go upward," it was so

called. The LXX. render it for the most part by ὁλόκαυστον or ὁλοκαυτωμα, as doth our apostle, Heb. x. 6,—that which is wholly consumed or burned, as this was, all but the skin; for the פֶּדֶר mentioned, Lev. i. 8, and chap. viii. 20, and nowhere else in the Scripture, rather signifies the whole trunk of the body, after the head was cut off, than the fat of the caul, as we render it. And it is not unlike but they might make use of the word ὁλοκαύτωμα, because the beginning of it answers in sound unto the Hebrew עֹלָה; for that they were at a loss in expressing the names of the particular sacrifices hath been declared. But עָלָה signifies "to ascend;" and because things that do so do disappear and seem not to be, it denotes also "to consume" or "to be consumed:" and from either of these significations this sacrifice which was wholly burned, may take its name.

19. In the manner of this sacrifice, it is observable that he who brought it was to put his hand on the head of it: Lev. i. 4, וְסָמַךְ יָדוֹ עַל רֹאשׁ הָעֹלָה;—"And put his hands upon the head of the burnt-offering;" lay them on, that the beast might seem to bear and sustain them. So we, after the Vulgar Latin, "manus suas," "his hands;" in the original, "his hand." And the Hebrews are divided whether he laid on only one hand, his right hand, or both. In chap. xvi. 21, where the high priest was to perform this duty in the name of the people, it is said expressly that he shall put שְׁתֵּי יָדָו, "both his hands," on the head of it; whence most conclude that both the hands are here also intended. But this seems rather to be an argument unto the contrary; for in saying that the high priest (who was to offer for himself as well as for the people), in his performance of this work, shall lay on "both his hands," and when a private person did it he shall lay on "his hand," the Holy Ghost seems to intimate a difference between them in this action. And this ceremony was observed only when the offering was of beasts, not so when it was of fowls or birds. And when the season of the sacrifice was stated by God's prescription for the use of the people, the priest was to perform this duty. The meaning of the ceremony was, "quod illorum capiti sit," typically and representatively to impose the sin of the offerer on the head of the offering; to instruct us in the bearing of our sin by Christ, when, through the eternal Spirit, he offered himself unto God.

20. Secondly, The beast, now a corban, by being brought unto the altar, was to be slain: שָׁחַט אֶת־בֶּן הַבָּקָר, Lev. i. 5;—"He shall kill the bullock." That is, say some, he that brought the offering was to kill it; for, say they, those that killed the offering are distinguished from them that took the blood of it, and sprinkled it on the altar: 2 Chron. xxix. 22, "So they killed the bullocks, and the priests received the blood, and sprinkled it on the altar." But those slayers seem not to have been the people, but the Levites,

who were to assist the priests in their service, Num. viii. 19, and who in all greater sacrifices did the outward work of killing and flaying, see 2 Chron. xxxv. 10, 11; as also it is said expressly that they slew the paschal lamb, 2 Chron. xxx. And unto this killing of the bullock, or kid, or lamb, answered the wringing off of the head of the bird, if the burnt-offering were of fowls, which is expressly said to be done by the priest, Lev. i. 15. And of him that kills the offering, verse 5, it is said, "He shall flay it, and cut it into his pieces," verse 6; which was the work of the priests and their assistants.

The place where it was to be killed was on the north side of the altar, verse 11; and when it was killed, the blood was taken, or wrung out, and "sprinkled about upon the altar," verse 5; which sprinkling of blood was used in all sacrifices of living creatures, as eminently prefiguring our sanctification, or purifying of our hearts from an evil conscience, by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, Heb. ix. 14, xii. 24.

21. The beast being killed, was flayed and opened,—made γυμνὸν καὶ τετραχηλισμένον, "naked and opened;" which our apostle alludes unto, Heb. iv. 13. Afterwards it was cut into pieces, Lev. i. 6; which pieces were salted, chap. ii. 13, and then laid in order on the wood upon the altar, chap. i. 8; as also were the legs and inwards, after they were washed, verse 9,—as our bodies, in our approach unto God, are said to be "washed with pure water," Heb. x. 22. The everlasting fire, typing out the eternal Spirit, through which Christ offered himself unto God, Heb. ix. 14, being applied by the priest unto the wood, the whole was incinerated, Ps. xx. 3, continuing to burn, it may be, all night long, though no sacrifice was to be offered but by day, which made them "watch for the morning," Ps. cxxx. 6. The differing ceremonies in killing and offering of the fowls are clearly expressed in the same chapter.

22. The end of this offering was always *to make atonement.* So the text, נִרְצָה לוֹ לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו, Lev. i. 4;—"It shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him." כָּפַר, says one,[1] "quod Latinè vertitur expiare, hic est, Deo aliquem commendare,"—it is "to commend any one to God;" a sense which neither will the word bear nor the nature of the thing admit. נִרְצָה is always "to be accepted." And for what end shall the sacrifice be accepted? לְכַפֵּר, "to appease, atone, to make atonement for him," as we shall show elsewhere; not absolutely, this it could not do, but in a representation, as they were "a shadow of good things to come," Heb. x. 1–4, 11.

23. There are reckoned up eighteen times wherein this kind of offering was to be made, by express institution; the enumeration whereof belongs not unto us in this place. Nine of them refer unto

[1] Hugo Grotius, in loc.—Ed.

particular occasions and emergencies; the other nine had their fixed seasons, occurring daily, monthly, or annually. Only, we may observe that of this kind of offering was the תָּמִיד, "the juge sacrificium," or continual sacrifice, which was offered morning and evening; with whose final removal or taking away the church and worship of the Jews utterly ceased, Dan. ix. 27. And as it had a precise command for its being offered morning and evening continually, so in the constant acknowledgment of God therein, in the vicissitudes of night and day, there was such a suitableness to the light and law of nature in it, that it prevailed among the heathen themselves in their idolatrous services. Witness that of Hesiod, Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμ. 338:—

> Ἄλλοτε δὴ σπονδῇς θυέεσσί τε ἱλάσκεσθαι,
> Ἠ μὲν δ' εὐνάζῃ καὶ ὅταν φάος ἱερὸν ἵλῃ·—
> "Let offerings and sacrifices burn
> At evening and at sacred light's return."

And so at Rome, the Pinarii and Potitii sacrificed to Hercules in Ara Maxima, morning and evening, as Livy, Plutarch, and Dionysius testify. The custom also of feasts at this sacrifice, to testify mutual love and peace amongst men, was common with the Jews and the Gentiles. Thus when Jethro, Moses his father-in-law, offered a burnt-offering and sacrifices, Aaron and all the elders of Israel came to eat bread with him before God, Exod. xviii. 12. And so also in the sacrifices that Agamemnon offered in Homer, Iliad. B, he called the ancients and princes of the Grecians to a banquet at them with him; as did Nestor likewise with those about him, at his great sacrifice, Odyss. Γ.

24. The next sort of offerings that was regulated in the law was the מִנְחָה, which, as it denoted an especial kind of sacrifice, we have from the matter of it rendered "a meat-offering," Lev. ii. 1. And this, as was said of the whole burnt-offering before, was not then first instituted and appointed, but only regulated and solemnly approved; for it had been observed from the beginning, and consisting in the fruits of the earth, had a great foundation in the law of nature. Thus Cain brought his מִנְחָה, "mincha," of the fruits of the earth to offer unto God, Gen. iv. 3. And there is no doubt but that, as to the kind of it, it was acceptable unto God, as of his own institution, though the person that offered it, for want of faith, was not approved, Heb. xi. 4.

25. The name, as was in part before observed, is, as of an uncertain original, so variously used and applied. Sometimes it is used for a civil gift of men one to another, or a present, 1 Sam. x. 27; sometimes for any offering or sacrifice. So Abel's sacrifice, which was in especial a burnt-offering, is called his mincha, Gen. iv. 4. Hence it is sometimes rendered in the New Testament by θυσία, "a sacri-

fice," "a bloody sacrifice," Mark ix. 49; Acts vii. 42. And our apostle, from Ps. xl. 7, renders זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה, "zebach" and "mincha," by θυσία καὶ προσφορά, Heb. x. 5, "sacrifice and offering;" by both which terms sacrifices of atonement and propitiation only were intended, and not the especial meat-offering, which was properly eucharistical, and not propitiatory. And the expression in that of the psalmist answers directly unto what God speaks concerning the house of Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 14. The sin of the house of Eli shall not be expiated, בְּזֶבַח וּבְמִנְחָה, "neither by zebach nor by mincha;" that is, by no sort of sacrifices appointed to make atonement or to expiate sin. So also is the word used, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. But as it denotes the especial offering now under consideration, it was not ordinarily appointed to make atonement. I say not *ordinarily*, because there was an especial dispensation in the case of the poor man, who was allowed to bring flour and oil, the matter of the mincha, instead of the אָשָׁם, "asham," or "trespass-offering." Lev. v. 11–13. And yet atonement properly was not made thereby; only in it, or the appointment of it, there was a testification of God's acceptance of the person, with a *non obstante* for his trespass. And hence doth our apostle use his σχεδόν, his "almost," in this business: Heb. ix. 22, "Almost all things are purged with blood." The like allowance was made in the offering of the jealous person. It was to consist of barley meal, the matter of the meat-offering: but it made no atonement; for it is expressly said that it was to "bring iniquity to remembrance," Num. v. 15, whereas every sacrifice of atonement was for the covering of sin and the casting of it out of remembrance.

26. As the mincha denotes a peculiar offering, whose laws and ordinances are recorded, Lev. ii. 1, 2, etc., the matter of it was,—1. סֹלֶת, "soleth," "simila," verse 7; that is, "the flour of wheat." So it is expressed, Ezek. xvi. 13, 19. In one case, קֶמַח שְׂעֹרִים, "farina hordeacea," "barley meal" (so we render the word), was used, Num. v. 15. But קֶמַח, "kemach," is properly "bran," "barley bran." This was the offering in the case of jealousy; God appointing therein the use of barley, the worst of bread-corn, and the bran of it, the worst of that grain, prohibiting the addition of oil and frankincense, to testify his dislike of the matter, either in the sin of the woman or the causeless jealousy of the man. 2. בִּכּוּרִים, "biccurim," "primæ fruges, frugum primitiæ," "first-fruits;" that is, אָבִיב, "corn newly ripened in the ear." 3. *Oil.* 4. *Frankincense.* 5. *Salt*, Lev. ii. 1–3, etc. And the use of two things is expressly forbidden, namely, leaven and honey, verse 11. Hereunto also belongeth the נֶסֶךְ, "nesek;" or "drink-offering," which was an addition of wine unto some sacrifices, but never used separately. And the psalmist shows how this degenerated amongst idolaters, who in their

superstitious rage made use of the blood of living creatures, it may be of men, in their "libamina." They had נְסָכִים מִדָּם, "drink-offerings of blood," which he abhorred, Ps. xvi. 4.

27. Now this offering was sometimes offered alone by itself, and then it was of the number of free-will offerings, whose law and manner are prescribed, Lev. ii. For the most part, it was annexed unto other sacrifices, and it was either stated and general, or occasional and particular. The stated meat-offerings, say some, concerned the whole congregation; and they reckon up three of them:—1. The *wave sheaf*, Lev. xxiii. 10, 11; 2. The *two wave loaves*, verse 17; 3. The *daily shew-bread*, chap. xxiv. 5. But whereas we have showed that the מִנְחָה, "mincha," was one of the אִשִּׁים, or "a fire-offering," and also that it was קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "most holy," Lev. ii. 10, these being neither of them, they belonged unto the terumah (of which afterwards), and were none of them mincha, or the meat-offering, properly so called. It is true, at the offering of the wave sheaf and the wave loaf there was a meat-offering offered unto God, consisting of two-tenth deals of soleth; or wheat flour, mingled with oil, and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink-offering, which were burned in the fire, Lev. xxiii. 9–13; but themselves were a terumah, and not a mincha. The particular and occasional offerings of this nature are reckoned to be, —1. The *poor man's offering*, Lev. v. 11; 2. The *jealousy offering*, Num. v. 15; 3. The *offering of the priests* at their consecration, Lev. viii. 26–28; 4. The *high priest's daily meat-offering*, Lev. vi. 20; 5. The *leper's offering*, Lev. xiv. 10; 6. The *dedication offering*, mentioned Num. vii. But some of these have a participation in the matter, but not in the nature of the especial mincha. The principal signification of this offering is expressed, Isa. lxvi. 20, compared with Rom. xv. 16; Mal. i. 10, 11, compared with 1 Tim. ii. 8. And two things in it express the grace of the covenant; first, the handful that was for a memorial,—that is, to bring to memory the covenant of God; and, secondly, the salt, which declared it firm and stable.

28. Hereunto, as we have said, belongs the נֵסֶךְ, "nesek;" which, as directed in the law, was but one part of the mincha, and is not reckoned among the distinct species of offerings, as they are summed up, Lev. vii. 37: and the reason is, because under the law it was never offered alone by itself, but as an appendix unto burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and peace-offerings, to complete the mincha, or meat-offering, that accompanied them. But of old, before the reformation of sacrifices by Moses, it was a distinct offering by itself: Gen. xxxv. 14, "Jacob offered a drink-offering," that is, of wine, which was the primitive institution and practice. And it was always to be of wine, Num. xv. This, chap. xxviii. 7, is called שֵׁכָר, "shechar;" which although we generally translate "strong drink," yet it appears from hence to have been a strong, inebriating wine; and so

the most learned of the Jews suppose. We call this "nesek," "a drink-offering," in answer to the name we give unto the "mincha," "a meat-offering;" that is, offerings whose matter was of things to be eaten and drunk. It may be otherwise called "a pouring," an offering poured out, "libamen," a sacred effusion. And these offerings were most holy also, Lev. ii. 10.

29. These offerings of the fruits of the earth, as they were in use among the heathen, so the most learned of them did contend that they were far the *most ancient kind* of sacrifices amongst men, as Plato expressly, lib. vi. de Legib.; but we know the contrary from Gen. iv, where the first sacrifices in the world are recorded. The later Pythagoreans also condemned all other offerings, all that were ἐκ τῶν ἐμψυχῶν, "of living creatures," as I have elsewhere showed out of Porphyry; though Cicero testifies of Pythagoras himself that he sacrificed an ox. And whatever was appointed in this meat-offering they also made use of. Their "far," "mola salsa," οὐλόχυτα, —that is, "flour of wheat," or barley mingled with water and salt,— is of most frequent mention amongst their sacred things: so also were their "placentæ" and "liba adorea," their cakes made with flour, oil, and honey. What was their use to the same purpose of wine and frankincense, the reader may see at large in the seventh book of Arnobius adversus Gentes.

30. The next solemn sacrifice, in the order of their appointment under the law, is that which is called זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים, "zebach shelamim;" which we render "peace-offerings," Lev. iii. 1. It is by translators rendered with more variety than any other word used in this matter: By the Greeks, θυσία σωτηρίας, and τῆς τελετῆς, and αἰνέσεως, and τελειώσεως,—"a sacrifice of salvation," "of expiation," "of praise," "of perfection." And the Latins have yet more varied in their expression of it: "Sacrificium pacium," "perfectionum," "gratulationum," "salutis," "retributionum," "integrorum," "mundorum," "sanctificatorum," "immaculatorum;"—"A sacrifice of peace," "of perfection," "of thanksgiving," "of safety or salvation," "of retribution," "of them that are clean, or sanctified, or unspotted." Most of these various expressions also arise from the different significations of the word שָׁלַם, whence most suppose that שְׁלוֹם was taken. But others think that it comes from שָׁלוֹם, "peace;" which of late is almost generally received. In general this sacrifice was "corban," a gift or offering brought nigh and dedicated unto God; and אִשֶּׁה, "a firing," or an offering by fire; and *in specie* זֶבַח, "a sacrifice," from the killing and flaying of the beast that was offered. But it is nowhere said to be קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, or "most holy," as being merely expressive of moral duties, in a way accommodated to the present economy of divine worship, see Heb. xiii. 15, but it is usually reckoned amongst them that were so.

31. *Peace-offerings*, as was observed, is the name that hath prevailed, though it respected *vows of thanksgiving*, or for the impetration of mercies: see Lev. vii. 11–18. The reason given by Jarchi for this appellation, namely, "Because it brought peace unto the world," is like much of what they say in such cases,—a sound of words without any meaning. Kimchi gives a more sober and rational account of it. "The עוֹלָה," saith he, "or 'burnt-offering,' was all of it burned, only the skin was the priests'. The חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם, 'sin and trespass offerings,' were burned in part; the breast and shoulder were the priests', and all the flesh that was not burned, as also the skin. But in this sacrifice, שְׁלָמִים, the fat ascended on the altar, the breast and shoulder were the priests', the residue of the flesh belonged unto the offerers, or them that brought it, to eat themselves; and so it was a sacrifice of peace among all parties." If this reason please not, we may choose one of the other significations of the word, as of "perfections" or "retributions;" which latter the nature of it inclines unto.

32. The *matter* of this sacrifice was the same with that of the burnt-offering,—namely, as to beasts of the herd, bullocks or heifers; of the flock, goats, rams, lambs, or kids; of fowls, the same with the former, Lev. i. In the *causes* of it, it was either a free-will offering for impetration, or from a vow for thanksgiving or retribution. The appointed *seasons* and occasions of it were,—1. At the consecration of a priest, Exod. xxix.; 2. At the purification of a leper, Lev. xiv.; 3. At the expiration of a Nazaritical vow, Num. vi. 14; 4. At the solemn dedication of the tabernacle and temple, Num. vii., 1 Kings. viii. The *manner* of its offering is peculiarly described, Lev. iii., and the Jews' observations about it the reader may see in the Annotations of Ainsworth on the place.

33. Two things were peculiar to this sacrifice:—First, That it is appointed to be offered על־הָעֹלָה: Lev. iii. 5, "And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar עַל־הָעֹלָה;" that is, saith the Vulgar Latin, "in holocaustum," "for a burnt-offering," as though itself were so, or substituted in the room of the whole burnt-offering. The LXX., ἐπὶ τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα, "upon the burnt-offerings." So we, "upon the burnt-sacrifice." But what is the intendment of that expression is not so evident. The Jews say that the daily burnt-offering is intended, which was always first to be offered, and then immediately upon it, or whilst it was yet burning, the peace-offering was to be added thereunto. It is not, indeed, declared whether the ghola mentioned was the daily burnt-offering or no; most probably it was so: and that, being a sacrifice of atonement, rendered this of thankfulness acceptable unto God. See Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

34. Secondly, The peculiar *parts* of the beast in this sacrifice that were to be burned on the altar are enumerated,—namely, the suet

and fat of the inwards, the kidneys and their fat, the fat on the flanks, and the caul of the liver, or the midriff. Hence it is laid down as a general rule, that "all the fat is the LORD'S," Lev. iii. 16; and it is called "a perpetual statute" for all their generations throughout all their dwellings, that they should eat no fat, verse 17. But yet this general precept had a double limitation:—1. That only that fat which was to be offered was excepted from eating. Of the other fat diffused through the rest of the flesh they might eat. 2. It was only the fat of beasts appointed to be offered in sacrifice that was forbidden, as it is directly expressed, Lev. vii. 25. Of the fat of other clean beasts they might eat. And this offering of the fat seems to denote our serving of God with the best that we have; which yet is not acceptable but by virtue of the blood of Christ, as the fat was to be burned on the burnt-offering, or sacrifice of atonement.

35. Of the kind of these shelamim were the offerings among the heathen, which they sacrificed either upon any great undertaking, which they called ἐξόδια, in a way of vow, or upon any success. So Cyrus Minor, Xenophon, and Arrian, in their expeditions, sacrificed "sacrificia votiva." And the latter sort were in an especial manner provided for in the pontifical law, as it is reported by Festus: "Cujus auspicio classe procincta opima spolia capiuntur, Jovi feretrio darier oportet, et bovem cædito qui cepit æris ducenta. Secunda spolia in Martis aram in Campo, solitaurilia utro voluerit cædito. Tertia spolia Jano Quirino agnum Marem cædito centum qui ceperit ex ære dato."

36. The next sort of sacrifice was the חַטָּאת, "chataath," or "sin-offering," whose laws and rites are described, Lev. iv. This sacrifice is not expressly called a *corban*, or a *gift*, it being wholly a *debt*, to be paid for expiation and atonement; but being brought nigh unto God, it partook in general of the nature of the קָרְבָּנִים, "corbanim." It was of the אִשִּׁים, "firings," or fire-offerings, expressly, verse 12, because of the burning of the fat on the altar; and of the זְבָחִים, or "slain sacrifices." And also, it was of the קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, or "most holy things," from its institution and signification. The name of it is חַטָּאת, "chataath," that is, "sin:" "He shall do to the bullock as he did לְפַר הַחַטָּאת,"—"to the bullock of the sin;" that is, of the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 20. So Lev. iv. 25, "The priest shall take מִדַּם הַחַטָּאת,"—"of the blood of the sin;" that is, the sin-offering. חָטָא, "chata," in Kal, is "to sin, to offend, to err from the way, to contract the guilt of sin." Hence חַטָּאִים, "chataim," are men given up unto and wandering in the ways of sin, Ps. i. 1. In Pihel it hath a contrary signification, namely, "to purge, to expiate, to cleanse, to make atonement, to undergo penalty, to make satisfaction:" Gen. xxxi. 39, "That which was torn," saith Jacob to Laban, "I brought

it not to thee, אֲחַטֶּנָּה," "achatennah,"—"I answered for it;" "I paid for it;" "I went by the loss of it." See Exod. xxix. 36; Num. xix. 19; Lev. vi. 23. According to this signification of חָטָא, חַטָּאת is used to denote an offering for sin, that whereby sin is expiated, pardon of it is procured, atonement is made. So prays David, Ps. li. 9, תְּחַטְּאֵנִי,—"Thou shalt purge me with hyssop," as Num. xix.; that is, "clear me, free me," as by an offering for sin. And this kind of expression our apostle retains, not only where he reports a testimony of the Old Testament, as Heb. x. 6, Ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, "burnt-offerings, and for sin," that is, חַטָּאת, "sin-offering;" but also where he makes application of it unto the Lord Christ and his sacrifice, which was typified thereby: Rom. viii. 3, "God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and περὶ ἁμαρτίας," that is, חַטָּאת, "an offering for sin, a sin-offering," as the word should have been translated; and 2 Cor. v. 21, "Him who knew no sin, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε," "he made sin" (חַטָּאת, "a sin-offering") "for us."

37. The general cause of this sacrifice was sin committed בִּשְׁגָגָה, Lev. iv. 2; say we, "through ignorance." So the LXX., ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ; and the Vulgar Latin, "per ignorantiam," "through ignorance." Some old copies of the Greek have ἀκουσίως, "not voluntarily, not wilfully;" for it had respect unto all such sins as were not committed so ἑκουσίως, "willingly, wilfully, presumptuously," as that there was no sacrifice appointed for them, the covenant being disannulled by them, Heb. x. 26. And there is no sort of sins, no sin whatever, that is between this שְׁגָגָה, this sin of "ignorance," or error, and sin committed בְּיָד רָמָה, "with an high hand," or presumptuously. See expressly, Num. xv. 27–31. Hence this חַטָּאת, this "sin-offering," was the great sacrifice of the solemn day of expiation, Lev. xvi., whereby atonement was made for all "the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins," verse 16. And upon the head of the live goat, which was a part of the sin-offering on that day, there was confessed and laid "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins," verse 21; that is, all iniquities not disannulling the covenant, which had ἔνδικον μισθοποδοσίαν, a revenging recompense allotted unto them, Heb. ii. 2. And accordingly are those words to be interpreted where the cause of this sacrifice is expressed: Lev. iv. 2, "If a soul sin בִּשְׁגָגָה,"—"by error, ignorance, imprudently,"—"against any of the commandments of the LORD, as it ought not to do, and shall do against any of them." And an instance is given in him who killed his neighbour without prepense malice, Deut. xix. 4. Any sin is there intended whereinto men fall by error, ignorance, imprudence, incogitancy, temptation, violence of affections, and the like. For such was this sacrifice instituted. And the end which it

typically represented is expressed, 1 John ii. 1, 2, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins,"—namely, in the room of and as represented by the sin-offering of old, whereby atonement and propitiation were typically made for sin. Only, there was this difference, that whereas the law of Moses was appointed to be the rule of the political government of the people, wherein many sins, such as adultery and murder, were to be punished with death, and the sinner cut off, there were in such cases *no sacrifices* appointed nor admitted; but in the sacrifice of Christ there is no exception made unto any sin in those that repent, believe, and forsake their sins,—not unto those in particular which were excepted in the law of Moses, Acts xiii. 39. So that as the sin-offering was provided for all sins that disannulled not the covenant made at Horeb, which allowed no life or interest unto murderers, adulterers, blasphemers, and the like, in the typical land; so the sacrifice of Christ is extended unto all sinners who transgress not the terms and tenor of the new covenant, for whom no place is allowed, either in the church here or in heaven hereafter.

38. Of the *matter* of this offering see Lev. iv.; which, because it differed very little from the matter of the burnt-offering, I shall not particularly insist upon it.

As to the *persons* that were to offer it, there is a general distribution of them in the text, comprehensive of all sorts of persons whatever: for it is applied to,—1. The *priest;* 2. The *whole congregation* jointly; 3. The *ruler;* 4. Any of the *people of the land:* so that none were excluded from the privilege and benefit of this sacrifice.

The first person mentioned is הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ, "the anointed priest," Lev. iv. 3;—that is, say the Jews generally, and our expositors also, כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, "the high priest," Aaron, and his sons that ministered in his room in their succession; for those only, say they, were anointed. But this seems not to be so, for if the high priest alone be intended, there is no provision made for any other priest to have an interest in this sin-offering; for the priests are not comprised in any other member of the distribution before mentioned, particularly not in that wherein with any colour they might be looked for, namely, the עַם הָאָרֶץ, verse 27, "the people of the land,"—that is, the common people, from whom the priests were always distinguished. Any priest, therefore, is intended; and מָשִׁיחַ, "anointed," is no more but dedicated, separated unto the office of the priesthood; or it respects that original anointing which they had all in their forefathers, the sons of Aaron, when they were first set apart to God, Exod. xxviii., xxix.

39. The case of the *priest*, wherein this sacrifice was allowed him, is expressed in the same place, with words somewhat ambiguous:

"If יֶחֱטָא לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם;"—"If he sin according to the sin of the people." So we. Castalio renders the passage, "Si sacerdos inunctus deliquerit in noxiam populi;"—"If the anointed priest so sin as to bring guilt upon or damage unto the people;" as Achan did, and David also. Vulgar Latin, "Delinquere faciens populum;"—"Causing the people to sin;" which is another sense of the words. And this sense the Jews generally embrace; for they apply this sinning of the anointed priest unto his teaching the people amiss, causing them to err thereby. So Aben Ezra, and others on the place, who are followed by many of ours. But if this be so, the priest was not allowed the benefit of this sacrifice of the sin-offering for any sin of his own, but only when he caused the people to sin also; which would render his condition worse than theirs, and is contrary unto that of our apostle, that the priest was to offer for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people. I would there, in לְאַשְׁמַת, take ל for כ, and render it with our translators, "according to,"—when he sinned as another man of the people, his place and office not freeing him from the common sins of other men. And so our apostle seems to expound this place, Heb. v. 2, 3. The priests of the law were compassed with infirmities; and by reason thereof had need to offer sin-offerings for their own sins as well as for the sins of the people, seeing they also sinned לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם, "according to the sins of the people," [Lev. iv. 3.] But it is otherwise now, saith he, with the people of God, Heb. vii. 26, 27, our High Priest being "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" that is, not sinning according to the sins of the people, as the priests did of old.

40. Secondly, The *whole congregation* jointly had an interest in this sacrifice when any such sin was committed as might reflect guilt upon it, Lev. iv. 13; for the observation of the law being committed in an especial manner unto the whole congregation, there were many transgressions in the guilt whereof the whole body of it might be involved.

Thirdly, The *ruler or rulers* had this privilege also, verse 22, with respect, as appears by this peculiar institution, unto his miscarriages in his office; God graciously providing a relief against the sins of men in their several conditions, that they might not, through a consciousness of their infirmities, be deterred from engaging in any necessary employment among the people when called thereunto.

Fourthly, Any one of the *common people* had the same liberty, and was obliged unto the same duty, verse 27.

And this distribution of the people, as to their interest in the sin-offering, comprising them all, even all that belonged unto the congregation of Israel, of all sorts and ranks, had its accomplishment in the sacrifice of Christ, from which none are excluded that come to God by him, for he will in no wise cast them out.

41. For the *time and season* of this sacrifice, it may be briefly observed that there were solemn and set occasions, some monthly, some annual, wherein it was to be offered for the whole congregation by especial command and institution: as,—1. On every *new moon;* 2. On the *fifteenth day of the first month*, and seven days together during the feast of unleavened bread; 3. At the feast of *first-fruits;* 4. At the feast of *trumpets;* 5. On the day of *expiation;* 6. On the *fifteenth day* of the seventh month, and for eight days together during the feast of tabernacles. And the frequent repetition of this sacrifice was to intimate that nothing was accepted with God but on the account of what was prefigured thereby, namely, that perfect sacrifice which took away the sin of the world. There were also especial occasions of it, with reference unto the persons before enumerated, which have been collected by others.

42. The principal ceremony in the *manner* of its oblation was the disposal of the blood; for the blood of this sacrifice had a triple disposal. The main of the blood was poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offerings, in the court before the door of the tabernacle, Lev. iv. 7. A part of it was taken and carried by the high priest into the sanctuary, and put upon the horns of the altar of incense that was therein, verse 7. The third part (which was first disposed of) was to be carried into the most holy place, as was done accordingly on the day of expiation, Lev. xvi. But because it was not lawful for him to enter in thither but once in the year, namely, on that day, at all other times he dipped his finger in the blood, and sprinkled it seven times towards the veil that parted the most holy place from the sanctuary, Lev. iv. 6. So that every place of the tabernacle, and all the concernments of it, were sanctified with this blood; even as Jesus Christ, who was represented in all this, was dedicated unto God in his own blood, "the blood of the covenant," Heb. x. 29. That seven is the number of perfection, greatly used and variously applied in the Scriptures, many have observed; and the perfect cleansing of sin by the blood of Jesus was evidently represented by this sevenfold sprinkling, Heb. ix. 13, 14; and therefore, in allusion hereunto, it is called "the blood of sprinkling," Heb. xii. 24, even that which was prefigured by all the blood of the sacrifices that was sprinkled towards the most holy place and the mercy-seat therein.

43. The next sort of fire-offerings was the אָשָׁם, "asham," whose laws and ordinances are declared, Lev. v., and the particular occasion of it, chap. vii. We call it the "trespass-offering." And it differed very little from that next before described; for it is not only said concerning them, כַּחַטָּאת כָּאָשָׁם תּוֹרָה אַחַת לָהֶם,—"As is the chataath, or 'sin-offering,' so is the asham, or 'trespass-offering;' there is one law for them," chap. vii. 7; but also that he who had

sinned or trespassed should bring his אָשָׁם ("his trespass-offering") "unto the LORD, for his sin which he had sinned, a female from the flock, or a kid of the goats, לְחַטָּאת,"—"for a sin-offering." Some think that there was a difference between them, and that it lay in this, that the chataath respected sins of omission, and the asham, sins of commission. But that this will not hold is openly evident in the text. Some think that whereas in both these offerings there was respect unto ignorance, that in the chataath was *juris*, of the right or law, that in the asham was *facti*, of the particular fact. But this opinion also may be easily disproved from the context. This to me seems to be the principal, if not the only difference between them, that the asham provided a sacrifice in some particular instances, which seem not to be comprised under the general rules of the sin-offering. And hence in a peculiar manner it is said of Jesus Christ, that he should give אָשָׁם נַפְשׁוֹ, "his soul an asham," or "piacular sacrifice," as for all, so for such delinquencies and sins as seem to bring a destroying guilt on the soul, Isa. liii. 10. And this kind of offering also was קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "most holy," Lev. vi. 23.

44. The last sort of fire-offerings were the מִלּוּאִים, which are reckoned as a distinct species of sacrifices, Lev. vii. 37,—that is, "plenitudinum, impletionum, consecrationum," "sacrifices of consecration," or that were instituted to be observed at the consecration of priests. Its name it seems to have taken from the filling of their hands, or their bringing their offering in their hands, when they approached unto the Lord in their setting apart unto office. And thence was the expression of him that came to be consecrated a priest: הַבָּא לְמַלֵּא יָדוֹ בְּפַר, 2 Chron. xiii. 9;—"He that came to fill his hand with a bullock." The rise of this expression we have marked before on Exod. xxviii. 41. The Lord giving directions unto Moses for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, he tells him, מִלֵּאתָ אֶת־יָדָם,—"Thou shalt fill their hand;" that is, put the flesh of the sacrifice, with the bread and its appurtenances, into their hands, which, being the initiating ceremony of their investiture with office, gave name afterwards unto the whole. And hence the sacrifices appointed then to be offered, although they differed not in kind from those foregoing, yet are accounted to be a distinct offering, and are called מִלּוּאִים, or "fillings."

And this may suffice as a brief account of the fire-offerings of the law of Moses, in whose use and end we are fully instructed in this Epistle to the Hebrews.

45. There was yet a second sort of corbans, or offerings unto God, under the law, which were of things, or parts of things, not burned on the altar, but one way or other devoted or consecrated to God and his service. These were the תְּרוּמוֹת, "terumoth;" which we have rendered sometimes "offerings" in general, and sometimes

"heave-offerings;" under which kind the תְּנוּפוֹת, or "wave-offerings," also were comprised. Concerning these, because the handling of them is not without its difficulties, being diffused in their use throughout the whole worship of God, and that some things not vulgarly known might have been declared concerning them, I thought to have treated at large; but whereas they are not directly referred unto by our apostle in this Epistle, and these discourses being increased much beyond my first design, I shall here wholly omit all further disquisition about them.

DATE DUE

[illegible]			
AUG 24 1989			
OCT 31 1989			
DEC 9 1989			

HIGHSMITH #LO-45220